DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 199 321 UD 021 223

AUTHOR Guskin, Judith T.; Alexander-Minter, Rae
TITLE Los Angeles School Desegregation: Legal, Administrative, Community and Anthropological Perspectives. A Symposium Report.
SPONS AGENCY Ford Foundation, New York, N.Y.
PUB DATE Nov 80
NOTE 78p.: Report of a symposium, "Anthropological Perspectives on School Desegregation: A Dialogue among Practitioners, Community Representatives, Scholars, and Legal Experts," at the Annual Meeting of the American Anthropological Association (Los Angeles, CA, November 17-18, 1978).

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC04 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Blacks; Busing; Community Role; *Desegregation Effects; *Desegregation Litigation; Desegregation Methods; *Desegregation Plans; *Educational Anthropology; Elementary Secondary Education; Ethnic Distribution; Ethnic Relations; *Ethnography; Hispanic Americans; Mexican American Education; Multicultural Education; Racial Composition; *School Demography; School Desegregation; Urban Demography
IDENTIFIERS *California (Los Angeles)

ABSTRACT

This report presents an anthropological perspective on the legal, demographic and community issues involved in school desegregation in Los Angeles. Views on the desegregation process expressed by lawyers, school administrators, community members, educators, and anthropologists who attended a 1978 symposium are summarized. An historical and legal review of desegregation issues in California from 1963 to 1978 is provided. Several issues pertinent to desegregation efforts in any large city are raised, including: (1) the status of minority multiethnic and multilingual groups other than blacks in desegregation remedies; (2) inclusion or exclusion of racially isolated schools in desegregation plans; (3) the definition of a desegregated school in districts where whites are the minority; and (4) problems of citizen involvement. The benefits of desegregation to different racial and ethnic groups are discussed. Also included are suggestions regarding the contributions anthropologists can make in clarifying problems in desegregation planning. (Author/APM)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED199321

LOS ANGELES SCHOOL DESEGREGATION: Legal, Administrative, Community and Anthropological Perspectives

Judith T. Guskin

and

Rae Alexander-Minter

A Symposium Report

This symposium was supported by the Ford Foundation. The authors are responsible for the content of this report.

November 1980

US 021223

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Judith T. Guskin

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

INTRODUCTION

On November 17th and 18th, 1978, in the midst of controversy over the initiation of desegregation in Los Angeles on September 12th of that year, a symposium was held entitled "Anthropological Perspectives on School Desegregation: A Dialogue Among Practitioners, Community Representatives, Scholars, and Legal Experts." It was sponsored by the Council on Anthropology and Education and its committee on Ethnographic Approaches to Evaluation in Education, and was part of the American Anthropological Association meetings. The organizers were Judith T. Guskin and Rae Alexander-Minter.

The atmosphere in Los Angeles was highly charged at that time. That very week, eight experts appointed by Superior Court Judge Paul Egly presented their reports. Headlines in the local press were dominated by discussions of their findings as well as controversial efforts to restructure the election of school board members to increase the potential for minority representation. This symposium, which involved administrators, lawyers, community activists who had played important roles in shaping the desegregation context, and anthropologists provided a timely opportunity to explore the issues of desegregation. Many people expressed their belief that it was a highlight of the American Anthropology Association meetings that year.

This report is a summary of the symposium with additional information from other articles and documents (published and unpublished), and newspaper accounts of desegregation issues at that time; it includes a review of the legal context, and some suggestions regarding the contributions anthropologists can make in clarifying perspectives and problems in desegregation planning. It is an effort to share with a broader audience how some individuals (black, Hispanic, Asian and white lawyers, administrators, community activists and scholars) perceived the issues involved in trying to desegregate the second largest school district in the United States, Los Angeles. While it took place during a particular point in time, the issues it raises must be addressed in desegregation efforts in any large city: these include the potential for a metropolitan solution, the status of minority multi-ethnic/multilingual groups other than blacks in desegregation remedies, the need to decide whether the most racially isolated schools are involved or left out of a desegregation plan, the definition of a desegregated school in

districts where whites are the minority, and the frustrations of citizen involvement. Scholars at the symposium tried to put current desegregation realities into an historical perspective, to discuss minority points of view regarding research on desegregation, to raise issues about the perceptions and meanings, goals and benefits of desegregation to different ethnic/racial groups, and to suggest ways to look at desegregated schools as well as to suggest ways anthropological research could be beneficial to an understanding of the processes of desegregation planning.

To the people involved in the symposium, as well as most Americans, Los Angeles is a unique place and one that is especially important nationally. According to a National Geographic article in January, 1979, Los Angeles is a city of illusions, contrasts, problems and promises. "It sets the tone and style for much of the country, and wherever other cities may go, Los Angeles is likely to have been there before. "It is, for good or ill, according to this writer, "the ultimate city of the 20th Century."[1] When Americans think of Los Angeles, they think of tinsel and Rolls Royces, smog and mud slides, riots in Watts, the growing East Los Angeles Hispanic barrio, freeways and Asian immigrants. It is a city that provides America with opportunities for cultural homogeneity through its production of films and records, but it highlights America's racial, linguistic, and ethnic diversity through the numerous, large ethnic enclaves where so many of its citizens live. It is a patchwork quilt of American success and failure, and as such reflects to the rest of the nation the conflicts built into our society.

This report is <u>not</u> meant to be an analysis of Los Angeles nor a thorough account of how desegregation came about and is proceeding in that city. Rather, it is to share how people who had a desire to bring about school change for minority students in Los Angeles perceived their efforts. The fact that it happened in Los Angeles with all its complexity makes it a microcosm capable of highlighting unsolved problems of national scope.

These two days of meetings offered a unique opportunity for anthropologists to experience a kind of "action research" within their home culture. Too often anthropologists have been trained to look for the "exotic" in distant countries. Los Angeles provided anthropologists with an appreciation of the complexity of the processes of desegregation planning as perceived by members of subordinate racial and ethnic groups as well as the dominant group within their own shores.

In organizing this symposium, Rae Alexander-Minter and Judith T. Guskin each made two trips to the West Coast during the Fall of 1978 to get a better understanding of the problems facing Los Angeles and to select appropriate participants. These trips to Los Angeles ranged from a length of three to ten days. Great care was taken to comprehend the enormity of the desegregation task as well as its effect on the lives of community members who were integrally involved in the desegregation process. During these visits, meetings were arranged with top school officials, principals, teachers, members of the Board of Education, pro and anti-busing groups, parents, city officials, and shop owners whose businesses were located in the area where busing was to take place. Every attempt was made to get what anthropologists call an emic[2] understanding of the community through the selection of those persons for the two-day symposium who best represented different perspectives on desegregation planning.

The symposium was composed of four panels, three on the first day and one on the second day. On Day I, three panels were presented, each reflecting an important group involved in the desegregation process: 1) lawyers and legal experts, 2) school district administrators, and 3) community members. Panel participants reflected the cultural and ethnic diverstiy of the larger community. On Day II, anthropologists and educators with special expertise in the subject reacted to the statements made the previous day as well as presented their own insights and knowledge on the topic.

The moderator of the first day of the symposium was Edmund W. Gordon. Dr. Gordon's work has had a major influence on the manner in which we understand the educational needs of America's poor and minority citizens. His sensitivity and clarity of perception were present in his role as moderator. He also was a presenter on Day II. Dr. Guskin served as moderator for Day II and as summarizer of Day I. Dr. Alexander-Minter provided an historical overview of anthropology of education on Day II.

A brief sketch of each of the symposium participants is given below:

DEMOGRAPHIC REALITIES

JEAN COHEN has been an Education Consultant and Member of the Education Committee of the Los Angeles League of Women Voters. She served on the steering committee of the California Task Force for Integrated Education. She is a member of the Speakers' Bureau of the Council for Peace and Equality in Education, and the Community Relations - Public Information Subcommittee of the school district's monitoring mommittee. She worked as Integration Factline Coordinator in the Los Angeles School System, and was Chairperson of the Venice High School Community Advisory Council. Previously, Jean Cohen participated on the Currently Integrated School Site Visitation Team, area D, in Los Angeles, the Citizens Advisory Committee on Student Integration, the Los Angeles County Commission on Human Relations Education Committee, and the Advisory Committee of the Los Angeles School District's Office of Multicultural Education.

A demographic overview of the state's student population was presented by Dr. Guskin, and this was followed by Jean Cohen's presentation of the demographic realities in Los Angeles.

LEGAL PERSPECTIVES PANEL

BEATRIZ ARIAS is presently Assistant Professor, School of Education, at Stanford University and was one of the eight experts appointed by Judge Egly to review the desegregation plan. Dr. Arias is an Assistant Professor of Education at UCLA Graduate School of Education. Her expertise is in bilingual education, curriculum and educational evaluation. She received her doctorate from Stanford University.

JOE DUFF is a member of the law firm Schockley, Duff & Hart-Nibbrig, a firm which has committed considerable time and effort (since February 1977) to the Los Angeles school desegregation case, Crawford vs the Los Angeles Board of Education. The firm participates in this case under the sponsorship of the NAACP and on behalf of the black and Hispanic students in the district. Mr. Duff attended UCLA School of Law where he developed his interest in urban law. He participated in the organization of the Black American Law Students Association and was a Director of the Community Participation Center, an organization for student voluntary action. While a law student, he also clerked for the Western Center on Law and Poverty, working on school finance, police malpractice, welfare reform and urban redevelopment cases.

CATHY DAVIS was Chairperson of the Southern California Education Committee of the American Civil Liberties Union. She was the plaintiffs' designated representative to monitor integration planning pursuant to the court order in Crawford vs Board of Education. Previously, she was a legal assistant to the ACLU, NAACP and the Center for Law and Justice for Crawford vs Board of Education case. She served as an ACLU representative to the Board of Education's Citizens Advisory Committee for Student Integration (CACSI). Prior to this, Cathy Davis served as a teacher for the Los Angeles Unified School District.

LYNN PINEDA, an attorney for the Los Angeles Center on Law and Justice, was the Hispanic lawyer in the coalition with the American Civil Liberties Union and NAACP which represented petitioners in Crawford vs Board of Education. He has helped organize and advise a community leadership coalition for the integration case, and has held press conferences with major media coverage. Mr. Pineda's practice has required him to do research and write legal briefs in a wide variety of areas, including bilingual education. In 1973, Mr. Pineda worked as a law clerk for the United States Commission on Civil Rights and in this capacity prepared and helped draft changes made by the Commission in its regulations and researched and wrote major staff reports to the Commissioners on Navajo Indian tribal government, the legal system, and educational issues.

ADMINISTRATORS' PERSPECTIVES PANEL

STUART BERNSTEIN is the Director of the Los Angeles School District's Office of Student Integration. In this capacity, Stuart Bernstein works with representatives from the central office and area district offices, in addition to serving in a liaison capacity with the appointed representatives from the courts and the community to facilitate implementation of the District's Student Integration Plan. He was formerly a principal of a predominantly minority school in Los Angeles and had prior experience as an educator in New York City.

REVEREND VAHAC MARDIROSIAN was born in Syria of Armenian parents and was reared and educated in Mexico; at the age of 19, he moved to the United States where he studied theology and education. Reverend Mardirosian was Director of the Headstart Program under the American Baptist Churches and founder of the program which was designed for Mexican-American children. He was founder and chairman of the Mexican-American Education Commission, an advisory body to the Los Angeles Board of Education; member of the Joint State Educational Goals Committee of the California Legislature; and member of the Los Angeles Urban Coalition, and the Educational Committee of the National Urban Coalition. Reverend Mardirosian was founder and Executive Director of the Hispanic Urban Center which provides teacher in-service training in the culture and heritage of the Mexican-American student. He has been employed as a Consultant to the Superintendent of Schools, Los Angeles Unified School District and was a member of the Council for Peace and Equality in Education.

ALFRED MOORE is presently principal of the 95th Street School in Los Angeles. Mr. Moore developed and helped write the Council of Black Administrators (COBA) desegregation plan, which was presented to the court and the Los Angeles Unified School District. He was president of COBA. Mr. Moore also was Research Analyst for the five Metropolitan NAACP Chapters of Los Angeles. He chaired the Education Research Committees of COBA, NAACP and the Black Leadership Coalition. He was a member of the first Los Angeles Unified School District (L.A.U.S.D.) Desegregation Task Force and of the Legislative Council of the National Alliance of Black

School Educators. In addition, he is also president of Moore Consultants which provides management development training for affirmative action, race relations and community relations programs.

COMMUNITY PERSPECTIVES PANEL

RUBY AGUILAR is business administrator for the Hispanic Urban Center in Los Angeles which runs workshops for teachers of Hispanic students. She was Chairperson of the Mexican-American Education Commission for the Los Angeles Unified School District and member of the Los Angeles Unified School Director's Monitoring Committee which was established by the Superior Court of the County of Los Angeles. She served as Chairperson of the Racially Isolated Schools Subcommittee. Ruby Aguilar was a member of the Los Angeles Unified School District "LAU COMMITTEE" which participated in the development of the District's "Lau" and Bilingual Programs. She was also a member of the Los Angeles Unified School District Affirmative Action Advisory Committee and a Founding Member of the Chicano Integration Coalition.

MARVIN TOM was a coordinator for the Integration Project, a community-based group which is an intervenor in the Crawford vs Los Angeles Board of Education case. As a member of the Integration Project since 1977, Marvin Tom conducted research on metropolitan desegregation. He was also involved in setting up a research foundation to provide social research to rural communities. He graduated from the University of California at Davis in Applied Behavioral Science.

ANNIE RICHARDSON is the mother of four children, ranging in age from 6 to 20. She spent 12 years working in the postal service in Los Angeles where she says she was a "frustrated activist". Failing to reorganize that bureaucracy, she says she "took on" the public school system of Los Angeles. She is a member of the Board of Education's Citizens Advisory Committee for Student Integration (CACSI) and in this capacity continues to work on the implementation of the district's desegregation plan. Annie Richardson is a vocal and articulate spokesperson for the rights of all children, and she serves as an inspiration and model for parents who want to influence educational institutions.

PAT BENSON's involvement in race desegregation began in 1971 in Rochester, New York, where she was a parent member of the Genesee Ecumenical Ministries Task Force on Urban Education. Her child, at that time, was bused to a bilingual program in a desegregated school. Ms. Benson is currently Director of Education for the Afro-American Cultural Education Center. She writes and edits newsletters, and is associated with the Martin Luther King Legal Association and the American Friends Service Committee. Ms. Benson participated in the California Task Force for Integrated Education and convened the Los Angeles School Integration Advocacy Network. She was host producer of the "Strawberry Shortbread", an education commentary regularly broadcast on public radio. She states that her "most engaging effort" is as the parent of three children in the desegregated Los Angeles schools.

SCHOLARS PERSPECTIVES PANEL

HENRY TORRES TRUEBA, Professor of Multicultural Education and Chairman of Multicultural Education Department, San Diego State University, has been active in the field of bilingual education for many years. From 1973 to 1978 he was an Associate Professor in the Department of Secondary Education at the University of Illinois, Champaign-Urbana where he also directed the Center for Materials Development and the graduate program in bilingual/bicultural education. Born and raised in Mexico, Dr. Trueba did anthropological research in Mexico leading to a Ph.D. awarded by the University of Pittsburgh in Anthropology. He has written articles and edited books on bilingual education, including one dealing with culture soon to be published by Newbury House.

DOROTHY C. CLEMENT is currently an Assistant Professor and Associate Chairperson of the Anthropology Department at the University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill. Prior to receiving her Ph.D. from the University of California, Irvine, in 1974, she worked as a consultant and staff member on a number of education projects. At the time of this symposium, she completed a two and a half year ethnographic study of a desegregated school, a project funded by the National Institute of Education. Dr. Clement's speciality areas include anthropology and education with a

particular focus on the position assigned minority students in the sociocultural organization of schools. At the time of this symposium in 1978 she had served as editor of a special issue of the Anthropology and Education Quarterly, 9 (4) entitled Cultural Patterns and Processes in Desegregated Schools, which included her article "Social Distinctions and Emergent student Groups in a Desegregated School."

EDMUND W. GORDON is currently a Professor of Psychology at Yale University's Bush Institute for Human Development and Social Policy. He was formerly Richard Hoe Professor of Education and Psychology at Teachers College, Columbia University and Director of its Institute for Urban and Minority Education. He has written and lectured extensively on the education of minority students. His skills as a moderator and a synthesizer of symposia on desegregation and related topics are widely recognized.

MICHAEL STOLEE is presently Dean of the School of Education, University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee and a Professor of Administrative Leadership. He began as a high school teacher and later was a Superintendent of Schools in Minnesota and an Instructor at the University of Minnesota. Before coming to UW-Milwaukee, he was Associate Dean and Professor of Education at the University of Miami-Coral Gables, Florida, and the Director of the Florida School Desgegration Consulting Center at that institution. His primary interests are in the area of desegregation. He has served as a court expert in many desegregation cases and has consulted on the topic of desegregation with local, state and federal officials.

JOHN U. OGBU was born in 1939 in Afikpo, Eastern Nigeria, and is now a permanent resident of the United States. He received his education at The University of California at Berkeley and is now a Professor in the Anthropology Department. Ogbu has won many awards and grants, including the Boobs-Merrill Reprints Award for an Outstanding Graduate Student in Anthropology in 1966, and an award from the Society for Applied Anthropology in 1978. His two books exemplify his approach to the study of education and inequality in the U.S. and in other societies: The Next Generation, An Ethnography of Education in an Urban Neighborhood,(New York: Academic Press, 1974), and Minority Education and Caste, (New York: Academic Press, 1978.)

ST. CLAIR DRAKE is best known as co-author with Horace Cayton of Black Metropolis and as an active participant in the Pan-African movement since WWII. He has published widely on Africa and black affairs in magazines and journals. From September 1969 - February 1973, he served as Chairman of the African and Afro-American Studies Program at Stanford University where he was Professor of Social Anthropology; he has recently retired from this position. He holds a B.S. degree from Hampton Institute and a Ph.D. from the University of Chicago. He was on the staff of Roosevelt University, Chicago, for two decades.

CO-ORGANIZERS

JUDITH T. GUSKIN is currently Adjunct Associate Professor of Anthropology at the University of Wisconsin-Parkside in Kenosha, Wisconsin and is conducting research on bilingual education funded by the National Institute of Education. She received her Ph.D. from the University of Michigan, and was previously an Assistant Professor at Clark University. Her work is in the areas of sociolinguistics, desegregation and bilingual education. She has worked extensively with school districts undertaking educational planning for language minority students throughout the Midwest. Her recent publications include "What the Child Brings and What the School Expects: First and Second-Language Learning and Teaching in Bilingual-Bicultural Education", in A. Simoes, Jr. (ed.) The Bilingual Child, Research and Analysis of Existing Educational Themes (New York: Academic Press, 1976) and Judith T. Guskin, Ricardo Fernandez and Tony Baez, Desegregation and Hispanic Students: A Community Perspective (Rosslyn, Virginia: National Clearinghouse for Bilingual Education, 1980).

RAE ALEXANDER-MINTER. Minter is currently teaching and doing research on black student language and learning patterns at The Hawthorne School in Washington, D.C. She has worked at the National Institute for Education and has had experience as a curriculum developer, language arts specialist, and early childhood education test developer. Her book, Young and Black in America (New York: Random House, 1970), was acclaimed as one of the outstanding children's books of 1970. Her doctoral research at the University of Pennsylvania on an urban black community in Philadelphia

involved a four-year ethnographic and ethnohistorical study of a two-centuries old black community. She trained black and white junior high students in ethnographic methodologies as a part of this study.

DEMOGRAPHIC REALITIES:

After introductory comments by Judith Guskin about national and state demographic changes the symposium opened with a presentation by Jean Cohen, Educational Consultant for The League of Women Voters, who presented an overview of the size and changing ethnic composition of the district. This section is taken mainly from her presentation, but also includes data from newspaper articles, reports of court-appointed expert witnesses, a California State Department of Education report, and Los Angeles School Board figures of school ethnicity and enrollment at the time of the symposium.

Los Angeles Unified School District has 710 square miles and an enrollment of over 500,000. In 1978 there were 436 elementary schools, 75 junior high schools, and 49 senior high schools in the district, as well as many schools and programs for adults and handicapped persons. Included within the geographic area of the city are eight separate small cities and parts of ten others. L.A. has almost 14 percent of all the state's students.

In California as a whole, the minority student population has been increasing. According to a state survey in 1977,[3] 36.5 percent of the nearly 4.3 million students in the state were members of identified racial and ethnic minorities, compared to 25 percent ten years earlier. Hispanic students comprised nearly 21 percent, blacks 10 percent, and Asians, Pacific Islanders, Filipinos and Indians made up 1 percent. The largest increase has been that of Hispanic students, from 616,226 in 1967 to 892,113 in 1977. While minority enrollment rose, white enrollment decreased by 586,000 between 1967 and 1977.

The degree of segregation increased as well during the decade between 1967 and 1977; there was a 73 percent increase in the number of students served by predominately minority schools. According to state figures, 59 percent of all minority students in the state were in schools that were 50 percent or more minority. Nearly one-quarter of all black students attended schools that were 90 percent or more black.

Minorities represented only 14.5 percent of the state's teachers and other credentialed staff of schools. Hispanics had the greatest disparity; with 21 percent of the students, Hispanics were represented by only 4.9 percent of the staff. Seventy percent of all black credentialed staff were employed by predominately black schools and half of all Hispanic credentialed staff were employed in predominately Hispanic schools. In 1977 Los Angeles Unified School District black staff made up 16.6 percent of the total staff (black pupils were 24.6 percent) and Hispanic staff made up 6.2 percent of the total (Hispanic pupils were 34.9 percent).

In Los Angeles, the size of the minority student enrollment almost doubled that of the state as a whole; 66.4 percent of the student enrollment for 1977, (387,561 pupils out of a total of 584,038 pupils) were minority members. Of these, 34.9 percent were Hispanic and 24.6 percent were black. The Los Angeles white enrollment also decreased more rapidly; the white student enrollment fell from 56 percent to 30 percent in that approximate ten-year period. The Asian population was growing since approximately 40 percent of all new Asian immigrants in the country went to California, and many settled in Los Angeles. Thus, while the state as a whole had about 1 percent Asian students, Los Angeles had 6 percent Asians. Preliminary data in October 1978 indicated an increase in Hispanics to 38.5 percent and a slight decrease of other minority groups and a drop of 15.8 percent in white enrollment from 33.6 percent to 29.8 percent.

Many of the Hispanic students are limited English students and this group had increased in numbers in the state as a whole and in the Los Angeles Unified School District. According to a 1978 State Department of Education report (this report was quoted by Arias in her expert witness report, [4] November 6, 1978 and was written by Lopez and Cervantes, 1978), this population of non or limited English speakers has grown from approximately 234,000 pupils in 1975 to a projected 400,000 in 1982. In Los Angeles, the LES/NES students membered 56,036 in 1973-1974 and over 70,000 in 1976-1977. Approximately half of these students were reiceving some form of bilingual education in 1978, according to Beatriz Arias, one of the court's expert witnesses. The largest numbers of LES/NES students were to be found in the

lower elementary grades. Over 66,000 of the LES/NES students in Los Angeles are Spanish speakers. The next largest group with over 2,000 speakers are Koreans.[4] A breakdown of LES/NES pupils by language was provided by Arias. It is as follows:

1977 Survey of Non-English Speaking and Limited-English Speaking NES/LES

1.	Spanish	66,113
2.	Korean	2,099
3.	Cantonese	884
4.	Tagalog	818
5.	Japanese	493
6.	American	455
7.	Vietnamese	358
8.	Samoan	212
9.	Hebrew	133
10.	Arabic	115
		71,680
	Other	699
		72,379

In a report to the court, Bernard R. Gifford reviewed the patterns of segregation in the Los Angeles Unified School District in terms of changes in the ethnic composition of individual schools. He concluded that the number of all Hispanic and all black schools was increasing, as was the number of Hispanic-white schools which were in transition to becoming predominately Hispanic. Very little movement toward bi-racial/ethnic or tri-racial/ethnic schooling was taking place. Current movement patterns would clearly perpetuate segregation.[5]

LEGAL PERSPECTIVES PANEL

This discussion of the legal perspectives panel presentations of the symposium and related material is divided into four sections. First, there is a review of the legal context of the case from 1963 to the time of the symposium, with emphasis on the time most immediately preceding the symposium, Fall 1978. Next, a brief statement on metropolitan planning, since that issue was raised by the court experts as well as the panelists and received great publicity during the week of the symposium. This is followed by a discussion of one of the difficult questions of the desegregation case, the problem of defining who is a minority, which was raised by the symposium panelists, the audience, the court experts and the scholars. The final section deals with other issues raised by the participants on the panel, the moderator, or members of the audience.

In order to understand the feelings of anger and frustration on the part of the participants on this panel, it is necessary to provide the context for the legal aspects of desegregation in Los Angeles, as well as the major issues and chronology of events leading up to those events of Fall 1978. This is provided from supplemental materials in addition to the brief symposium presentations.

The Legal Context: (This summary briefly reviews legal issues from 1963 up to September 12, 1978, the day the first mandatory desegregation steps were taken.)

In California, segregation, regardless of cause, violates the State Constitution.[6] There is no distinction between de facto and de jure segregation. The California Supreme Court unanimously reaffirmed its position in handing down its opinion in the Los Angeles school desegregation case in 1976.[7]

A class action suit had been filed in August of 1963 by the American Civil Liberties Union and originally focused on two racially imbalanced high schools. Given the board's resistance, on July 6, 1966, (action on behalf of 13 black and 5 Mexican-American students), the suit was amended to include the entire Los Angeles district. While some small scale voluntary busing existed, the Board denied any wrongdoing. The case went to trial on October 28, 1968.

After 65 court days and 62 volumes of testimony, the judge concluded on February 11, 1970 that the Los Angeles Unified School District was, in fact, substantially segregated. The court made public the following findings:

1. Three out of every five schools were segregated over the 1966-1968 period according to existing statistics. (A segregated school was substantially more than 49 percent minority or 50 percent white. Most segregated schools had 90 percent or more minority pupils or white pupils.)

2. The Board had (according to documentation since May of 1963) knowingly, and affirmatively continued this segregation and by its policies allowed it to increase.

3. Minority segregated schools were of poorer quality and minority students were suffering serious harm.[8]

Judge Gitelson ruled against the School Board and asked for a desegregated plan to be in operation by September 1, 1970. The School Board continued to resist and appealed the decision to the State Court of Appeals. In March 1975 that court reversed Gitelson's ruling, saying that the segregation was not "intended". ACLU appealed to the California State Supreme Court.

On June 28, 1976 the California State Supreme Court affirmed the original decision and ordered the School Board to desegregate its schools. It was up to the Board to devise an acceptable plan for approval by the Los Angeles Superior Court. At that time the Supreme Court indicated that the State Constitution did not require a particular or identical racial balance in each school, but that the elimination of segregation and its harms was appropriate and a constitutional objective. A broad "definition" of segregation was discussed which included, in addition to the racial and ethnic composition of student body, factors of staff composition, community attitudes and quality of buildings. Reasonable and feasible affirmative steps to eliminate substantially segregated schools were required.

The district's defense had rested on two points: 1) that benefits did not outweigh costs; and 2) that the segregation was de facto in origin. Both were not considered as reasons to deny children's constitutional rights, the second on the basis of state law which clearly requires an end to segregation whether it be de facto or de jure in origin. Segregated schools are inherently unequal.

In February 1976, prior to the State Supreme Court ruling, the Board set up a Citizens Advisory Committee on School Integration, (CACSI), to advise the Board on ways to reduce segregation. The charge was clarified in April and CACSI was to develop a "feasible" and "reasonable" desegregation plan. Throughout a ten-month period, more than 100 citizens in this group deliberated the issues. A Mexican-American perspective was included in the discussions.

The CACSI plan presented to the Board on January 10, 1977 included the elimination of most one-race schools, a forty-five minute limit on transportation, and mandatory busing. It urged that beginning in September 1979 nearly 62,000 elementary children be reassigned to relieve racial isolation in 198 elementary schools that had 70 percent or more minority enrollment. Junior and senior high school students would become involved in desegregation in successive years. Twelve planning units were to be organized having approximately 70-30 minority to majority racial makeup. There was to be relief from overcrowding, maintenance and expansion of bilingual-bicultural programs, and careful grouping of students to maximize eligibility for funds. Extensive monitoring of the plan's implementation was also proposed.[9]

CACSI was never given full public or private support. Citizens expended considerable time and energy developing basic information without the assistance of experts in desegregation. The district provided only what was specifically requested; while claiming to support CACSI's independence, Board members and administration did little to guide or publicize the planning. Minority members were few in number, especially in leadership positions.

In January the CACSI plan was presented and rejected by the school board. The board came up with its own plan which was based on a part-time integrated learning experience for nine weeks a year. Instead of working closely with the citizen's group, the Board held back, rejected the citizen effort, then submitted what would clearly be an unacceptable plan. Most minority students would remain in racially isolated schools; some would have "an integrated educational experience" part time.

Efforts were to be primarily voluntary, with mandatory elements that affected minority students, i.e., satellite zoning to relieve overcrowding in segregated schools. Minority students were to do all the traveling in the expanded "permits with transportation" program. Racially or ethnically different schools were to be matched for once-a-month student interaction for one year. Curriculum options were to be provided for at least 50 of the 284 segregated elementary schools on a voluntary basis to encourage the reduction of racial isolation. Only if less than 50 chose not to participate would mandatory learning centers be created which would emphasize social studies and science.[10]

In February 1977, Superior Court Judge Paul Egly was appointed to review the Board's plan. It was rejected as inadequate in July of 1977. In Judge Egly's words, the plan failed "because it did not desegregate any school in the district, and even if it did, it would reach so few of the 231 segregated minority schools as to be really ineffective in desegregating this district".[11]

Using the district's figures, Judge Egly said that over 183 elementary schools, 26 junior highs and 22 senior highs are either 80 percent or more minority or white. The mandatory portion of the plan designates only 38 segregated elementary schools and 55 segregated minority elementary schools as schools to be definitely included in the process. A total of 111,761 of the 153,704 students in segregated elementary schools would remain racially isolated.

The Court called the "integrated learning experiences", which might be ten days a year, "field trips". While acknowledging the district faced a formidable task given its size, the court indicated that the plan was totally inadequate.

> It is clear from the evidence that this plan, even if approved by this court, would result in the district continuing to maintain three separate school systems; Brown, Black, and White, each isolated from the other.

In addition to rejecting the Board plan, the Court rebuked the Board for not taking the CACSI plan seriously enough:

> The Court specifically finds that the plan was hastily conceived as a reaction to the implementations of the Citizen's Advisory Committee on School Desegregation (CACSI) Plan, and that no effective in-depth study was made of the effect of the plan upon segregated schools of this district, nor any cost/benefit analysis made of the plan, nor any alternative plans seriously considered.

Judge Egly required the Board to present a new plan within 90 days which would realistically desegregate the district by no later than February 1978. A court referee was appointed to report to the Judge on the progress. Monroe Price, a 38 year old UCLA lawyer, was designated to fill this post.

On February 7, 1978, Judge Egly allowed a new plan to be implemented over a two-year period, without actually giving his approval to the plan as satisfying the need for an appropriate remedy. This plan provided for strictly voluntary programs for grades kindergarten to three and grades nine to twelve, and some mandatory reassignment if magnet schools did not desegregate adequately for grades four to eight. Schools with 70 percent or more Anglo or minority students were defined as "segregated".[12]

All in all, the plan was a very limited one. It could possibly involve mandatory busing of about 30,000 students in a district with close to 600,000 students. The implementation of the plan and its expansion were to be reviewed by the Judge at the end of December. Egly called the plan "a beginning" and expected to have it modified in light of information from the court's referee,

the monitoring process he was to set up, and the individual reports of eight court-appointed experts which were due on November. With more than 205 segregated minority schools in the district unaffected by the current plan, further expansion of the plan was likely. (As of November 1980, 264 schools are not included.)

The opponents to desegregation were not about to let the process have even this modest beginning. Encouraged by U.S. Supreme Court Justice Rehnquist's decision in August which ordered a stay in the use of busing in Columbus, Ohio, Bustop, the antibusing organization, prepared for battle. This battle was to take place just as the schools were preparing to open in September 1978.

Bustop asked the Court of Appeals to order a stay in the implementation of desegregation until there could be further review by higher courts. Three conservative judges, Roth, Beach and Compton, were to make the decision. These were the same three judges who had originally admitted Bustop as an intervenor in 1977. Compton, appointed by Governor Ronald Reagan, had served as a Deputy District Attorney in L.A. under Evelle Younger, who was now the Republican candidate for Governor and a strong antibusing supporter. The judges ordered a stay. After obtaining the stay, Bustop was to go to the State Supreme Court for affirmation of this decision.

In its last ditch efforts to prevent the "beginning" of desegregation, Bustop picked up a powerful ally - the Los Angeles School Board. One week before its own plan was to be implemented, on Tuesday, September 5, 1978, a request was filed with the California Supreme Court to delay it.

Headlines in the Los Angeles Times on Wednesday morning, September 6th, were in bold, black letters: BOARD OPPOSES ITS BUSING PLAN. Times writer, Oliver, began his story as follows:

> The Los Angeles Board of Education firmly squared off against its own desegregation plan Tuesday, in effect agreeing that the plan should not be put into operation when school opens next week.

The article went on to indicate that only two board members were opposed to the effort to delay, Board President Howard Miller, and Diane Watson, the only black member on the Board. Other Board members claimed that the Court of

Appeals stay given the previous Friday had slowed down preparations and therefore the school administration could not implement desegregation by that coming Tuesday. After 15 years, still another year was needed to get ready.

The state's attorney general, Evelle J. Younger, candidate for Governor and a busing foe, indicated that he would file a friend-of-the-court brief on Bustop's behalf, urging the Supreme Court to agree to the delay. Governor Brown indicated that he would not interfere and had faith that the Supreme Court Justices would make the "best judgment they can."

Over the Labor Day weekend, the lawyers for the minority plaintiffs wrote a brief for the State Supreme Court indicating that politics, not legal reasoning, were involved in this late effort for delay, and asked that it be overturned. They urged that the case not be taken out of Judge Egly's hands. While not pleased that Egly had permitted the district to implement this limited plan, nevertheless, they were aware that Judge Egly was going to review the implementation of the plan and wanted a new plan for expansion by December 31st. In addition, the Judge had appointed eight desegregation experts to study the situation in Los Angeles, hold meetings and gather data, and then report back to him.[13] The eight experts were Thomas Pettigrew, Gary Orfield, Bernard Gifford, Reynolds Farley, Beatriz Arias, Robert Crain, Elwood Hain, Jr., and Francine Rabinovitz. From the point of view of the plaintiffs' lawyers, the Bustop initiated stay request was little more than a thinly disguised cry of white resistance to desegregation. Declaring the Columbus case to deal with different circumstances, they reminded the California High Court that it was its 1976 Crawford decision, based on the State Constitution, that allowed some busing of children to be included as part of a reasonable desegregation plan.

A cartoon in the Los Angeles Times depicted Bustop as a huge hand which was squeezing a small school bus and crushing it. Labeled "The Boston Strangler", the cartoon was reminding its readers that in other places whites had attempted to stop desegregation, but had not succeeded. It looked as if Bustop might legally accomplish what others had tried to do with violence - impede the power of a judge to oversee a remedy for illegal segregation.[14]

The California Supreme Court acted quickly. On Wednesday, September 6th, it indicated that it refused to hold up the start of desegregation in Los Angeles.

Bustop officials said they were prepared for this and would go immediately to Washington to seek a stay from a Supreme Court Justice. This time, the Board decided by a 4 - 3 vote, not to go along. Board members on both sides expressed concern about the impact this last minute legal battle would have on public acceptance of peaceful desegregation. Board members were questioned about their own political motives.[15]

Clearly the tension in the city was mounting. Confusion was expressed by teachers, parents and students - those most affected by a decision either to go ahead with the plan or to abandon it. Teacher inservice sessions, usually held a week before school opens, were proceeding as planned, but the teachers did not know what would happen or how they should handle the unexpected events which might occur, given the climate of racial fear and animosity. Highly charged statements by Bustop leaders were coming over the media, and a white student boycott of schools was threatened. In meetings, white teachers would echo this issue of a boycott, while black teachers would indicate fears that the black students who would show up would not be treated with respect and acceptance. "Why do they do this to the kids? No matter what happens now, they're going to be upset."[16]

Parents did not know which schools their children would be attending. Late Wednesday night and early Thursday morning, the administration sent out letters to parents to inform them of school assignments. Many would not receive these in time. They were asked to call school administrators, the bus operations office, or the integration hotline.

"The parents are really angry," a mother said at a school meeting on Friday, September 8th. "This has been very difficult and very confusing. They've been bounced around."

An Hispanic mother, Mrs. Sanchez, worried about the effect of all this on her daughter: "What about the kids? They're making them feel like they don't belong. They're just pushing them around."[17]

The black mayor of Los Angeles tried to stay neutral, but keep people calm. He urged citizens to be law-abiding. Even though he was attacked by other blacks for not endorsing or condemning the plan or Bustop's actions, he made no comment about the specifics of the case. On a television show, "AM Los Angeles", on Thursday, September 7th, Mayor Bradley said, "I believe the people of the city understand we are a nation of laws." Later that morning, he released the following statement:

> One of the great strengths of our system of democracy is a deep-seated belief in the rule of law as a fundamental principle, even if some may disagree with it. It is therefore important that this city's leadership, parents and children devote our efforts to peaceful and reasonable compliance with the court order for desegregation.[18]

Meanwhile, Bustop leaders and others supporting their efforts to stop implementation of the law, took the "red-eye special" night flight to Washington, D.C. to track down a Supreme Court Justice who would be on their side. They felt that Justice Rehnquist was their best bet, since he ordered the stay of desegregation in Columbus, Ohio, and was just about to make a decision on an appeal by seven suburban districts to stop court-ordered busing in the Wilmington, Delaware case. No one seemed to know for sure what he would do in this Los Angeles situation.

Also on that night flight to Washington, D.C., was the L.A. County Deputy District Attorney. He wished to file a separate request to halt busing, claiming that the security of children could not be guaranteed if they were bused from West San Fernando Valley into South-Central L.A. (from white to minority areas of the city). While not present on the plane, California's Attorney General Evelle Younger sent Judge Rehnquist a telegram saying that in his opinion, the proposed busng plan was "onerous and potentially harmful". Two Los Angeles School Board members flew to Washington that night with the Bustop leaders.

On Friday evening, September 9, 1978, Judge Rehnquist refused to grant the delay. He emphasized that while he did not believe busing was legally required by the U.S. Constitution, he felt that the California case was a state matter. The busing required in L.A. was to meet the requirements of the

California State Constitution, not the U.S. Constitution. If that went beyond what was required by the U.S. Constitution, it was legal. He said:

> I conclude that the complaints of the parents and the children in question are complaints about California State Law, and it is in the forums of that State that these questions must be resolved.[19]

He called the desegregation plan in Los Angeles "one of the most extensive desegregation plans in the United States."

Still, Bustop lawyer Cliff Fridkis would not give up. Justice Rehnquist was not the only justice on the Supreme Court; he would find another who might be more favorable. On Friday, Justice Lewis F. Powell, Jr. received an application for delay. He would take the weekend to decide. Finally, he would refuse.

Back in Los Angeles, bus drivers were lining up for hours to select their routes.[20] School officials were issuing statements that the schools would open on Tuesday as usual, and the School Board President urged obedience to the law. He said:

> It is time now to put behind us the divisiveness of the recent past. We will learn many lessons on Tuesday morning. Among the most important for ourselves and our children will be that we do obey the law, and that we can do these things decently and well.

The Los Angeles Times, in an editorial on the morning of September 8th urged calm and patience, reprimanded the Board for its lack of leadership and vacillation, criticized the plan as one with "imperfections", but urged that desegregation begin at long last.

> There probably isn't anyone in this tortuous dispute, which started in 1963, who embraces busing as the best solution. But until people of different races live together in neighborhoods throughout the Los Angeles basin, schooling is going to be separate. Given the facts of life, this schooling is also going to be unequal, which the U.S. Supreme Court said in Brown vs Board of Education is unconstitutional. Los Angeles stands on the brink of trying to correct that inequality. With calmness and perserverance, the city can give to its children, whose educations are at stake, the support that they need and deserve.

On Tuesday morning, September 12, 1978, after 15 years of legal efforts, thousands of students in Los Angeles got on buses to new schools because of that constitutional commitment to equality.

Metropolitan Desegregation

On Monday, November 13, 1978, the week of our symposium, the experts appointed by Superior Court Judge Egly filed their reports with the court. The major recommendation to emerge from 940 pages of analysis was that the only way meaningful desegregation could be achieved was through a metropolitan plan that would involve the suburbs.

On Tuesday, banner headlines in the Los Angeles Times announced "Areawide Integration Urged."[21] This proposed metropolitan approach would include 82 school districts in Los Angeles County, most of the 29 districts in Orange County, the southern portion of Ventura County and perhaps, western sections of Riverside and San Bernardino counties. While many other recommendations were made, this one received the most immediate attention.

While controversial, the idea of a metropolitan plan was not a surprise. Judge Egly himself had mentioned the possibility of involving the state in metropolitan desegregation. William Tromley of the Los Angeles Times on November 7, 1978, said that this remedy had been prepared by lawyers in the 15 year-old Los Angeles case prior to the submission of the expert witnesses' reports.[22] Tromley reviewed the Milliken vs Bradley Detroit case in which, by a 5-4 vote, U.S. Supreme Court Justice determined that there was insufficient evidence to order a metropolitan plan for Detroit.[23] However, the door was not closed to future efforts to prove that a metropolitan plan was needed in other cases.

Metropolitan plans were approved by the Supreme Court in Wilmington, Delaware, Louisville, Kentucky, Charlotte-Meklenberg, North Carolina, and Nashville, Tennessee.[24] There are pending cases in Indianapolis, Indiana, Atlanta, Georgia, Cincinati and Cleveland, Ohio, and elsewhere.

Proponents of metropolitan plans indicate that it reduces bus travel time, saves money, combats "white flight" and provides the possibility of long-term solutions to the growing minority segregation in large cities. Evidence is needed for governmental (federal, state and city) involvement in actions that caused segregation, including evidence of housing discrimination practices. Exactly what will suffice depends on the local circumstances and the judges.

The court-appointed experts and the symposium participants indicated that if the current desegregation plan were followed, very little desegregation would take place. That, combined with the growing segregation, was going to mean a more segregated district in the future. In the words of Robert Crain, one of the court experts, "A desegregated Los Angeles school system can remain desegregated for several decades surrounded by a "white noose" of segregated suburban districts, but it cannot survive forever."[25]

The issue of declining white enrollment is closely tied to a metropolitan plan. Population expert Reynolds Farley projected Anglo enrollment in Los Angeles to drop to 14 percent by 1987 even without "white flight" due to desegregation; without desegregation, Anglo enrollment had been dropping from 4 to 12 percent a year. It was stressed by the experts that only a metropolitan solution would minimize white flight. While the metropolitan area would include some heavily minority cities, there would be enough white pupils to assure stable, integrated schools.[26]

Suburban school officials strongly denounced the idea of a metropolitan plan, but the lawyers for the plaintiffs from the American Civil Liberties Union, National Association for the Advancement of Colored People and the Center for Law and Justice, all of whom participated in the symposium, urged the Board of Education to adopt it. The anti-busing group, Bustop, as expected, opposed the idea. The Board didn't comment. Administrators of nearby school districts were opposed.[27]

Bobbi Fiedler, an antibusing member of the Board of Education, said she expected to pick up more support for her point of view. "The benefits could be a larger bloc of people to assist in lobbying for anti-busing legislation."

NAACP attorney Joseph Duff, one of the symposium members, praised the experts' reports and called on the School Board to "promptly endorse the reports."

Kathleen Rice, member of the Board of Education, said "experts blow in and out and we're left with trying to figure out what will work."

State officials said that they would remain "neutral" until the Supreme Court orders them to act.

While the Los Angeles Times editorial of November 16, 1978, entitled "The Metrolpolitan Plan", indicated that there was likely to be great opposition to the idea and many problems, it did stress some of the benefits as well and said it was "a starting point for discussion." A metropolitan plan was said to "provide the only way to thoroughly desegregate the Los Angeles School system . . . cut bus riders . . . permit the more efficient use of buildings . . . and add stability to desegregation efforts."

Who is a Minority?

Several symposium members alluded to this difficult issue, as did Judge Egly. This section integrates some of their comments as well as those of other expert witnesses. There was disagreement among the experts as to the appropriate status of Asians, Indians and Hispanics in this case. Tom Pettigrew, one expert, felt that all could be considered minorities for desegregation purposes; Robert Crain would only include Hispanics as a minority; and Gary Orfield wished to distinguish "acculturated" Hispanics from other Hispanics and include them as well as Asians and American Indians in the "mainstream" or "white" category.[28]

Crain presented evidence that the degree of segregation was greater for blacks than for other minority groups and therefore they were in greater need of desegregation. However, 106,073 (or 54 percent) of all Hispanic students were in schools with 10 percent or fewer Anglo students. 104,694 (or 82 percent) of all black students, and 8,634 (or 25 percent) of all Asians were in such schools. Hispanic segregation was increasing in Los Angeles and statewide .[29]

After reviewing existing data on intermarriage rates, Crain concluded that Asian Americans, Native Americans and Hispanics have a higher rate of intermarriage with Anglos than blacks and that these groups may thus need desegregation less than blacks need it. Instead of using the criteria of "combined minorities" to define a "desegregated school", he proposed that the number of minority group members in each district should be reviewed. He also proposed that Asian Americans and Indians not be treated as minority groups for desegregation purposes.

The situation of Hispanics is complicated. Crain indicated he was aware that the Texas approach of desegregating blacks by having them mix with Hispanics was an example of prejudice against Hispanics and not a fair remedy.[30] However, he felt that by the third generation, Hispanics in California were probably as assimilated as most European Americans.

While figures did show substantial residential segregation for Hispanics, it was less than that for blacks. In 1970, blacks had a segregation rating of 89 and Mexican-Americans of 53. In 50 years, he proposed that few people would agree that Hispanics required desegregation as a remedy.

Crain was reluctant to propose that schools which were Hispanic/white be considered desegregated since it would make it harder to desegregate blacks; yet, he could not leave segregated the Hispanics in the East Los Angeles barrio. However, to add social class and generational issues into a desegregation remedy would not be the proper route to take either. His solution involved a tri-ethnic plan which would "prevent naturally integrated Hispanics from displacing blacks from desegregation." Crain proposed that as Hispanics become more integrated in residential areas of the city, they would no longer be counted as needing desegregation. This, however, would be difficult to monitor and would probably still mean desegregating blacks with Hispanics in some areas. Crain felt that tri-ethnic schools would help Hispanics and blacks "overcome their fears of each other", but would mean transporting minority students from one segregated area to another.[31] This was not acceptable to him.

Hispanic members of this symposium were quite concerned. Two of the symposium's participants on the legal perspective panel raised this issue, Beatriz Arias, a Chicana faculty member at UCLA and the only Hispanic expert witness for the court, and Lynn Pineda, the lawyer for the Center for Law and Justice who represented Hispanics. A third Hispanic panelist, Ruby Aguilar, a member of the community panel, provided the symposium organizers with a position paper on this issue.

Lynn Pineda criticized those who would call Hispanics "white" and thereby use them to "integrate" black schools. He stressed the need to look at cultural identity and the history of the Hispanic group. Since the "mainstream" culture has never been broadened to include this culture, he said they shouldn't be considered "assimilated", nor should they be expected to "jump" into the mainstream.

Pineda also said that there have been several early court cases in which Mexican-Americans sued because they were illegally segregated. In addition to the Cisneros case, (Cisneros vs. Corpus Christi 324 F. Supp. 599), he mentioned that more than thirty years ago (1946), Mexican parents sued the Board of the Orange County district claiming segregation of Mexican-Americans

from whites was illegal. Quoting the Supreme Court decision Keyes in 1973 in Colorado, Pineda stressed that Mexican-Americans as a group should be considered a "victimized minority."

Beatriz Arias, the Chicana symposium participant who was the only Hispanic court-appointed expert, indicated that she also felt that Hispanics should not be considered as "white" for desegregation purposes. In her written testimony,[32] Beatriz Arias reviewed the diversity within the Hispanic group and the lack of existing data on the benefits that might accrue to Hispanics from schooling in desegregated settings. "Hispanic", according to her, is a cultural and linguistic designation, not a racial one. To decide who belongs to the group, she proposed using a combination of data on language use in the environment, values, and self-identification. Most Hispanics, over 90 percent, were said to be "not fully integrated" into the mainstream and should be considered to be a separate group for desegregation purposes. In order to handle the 10 percent who might be considered "acculturated", she proposed a weighted scale which would include use of Spanish, income, parental level of schooling, housing quality, values and other factors.

In designing a desegregation plan for Los Angeles, Arias proposed that community parameters be considered more important than individual characteristics. If schools that are most clearly "isolated" are desegregated first, this would take care of including Hispanics in the plan as an isolated minority group. Arias also reminded other symposium participants that one recommendation that received little attention was that the Spanish language be taught to all students in Los Angeles, since the district was becoming more and more Hispanic.

In the view of symposium panelist Ruby Aguilar, community leader and a business administrator of the Hispanic Urban Center, people are considered members of the Hispanic minority group because of the prejudice of the Anglo population which defines all members of that group in a negative way. Even though some Mexican-Americans may have achieved a degree of acculturation, she says in her position paper,[33] the "overwhelming majority of these pupils suffer from the same consequences of racial isolation as blacks..." those who are more "acculturated" are still viewed by the majority population as

"Mexican" and discriminated against. Given the large numbers involved and the relatively lower socio-economic status of most Hispanics, Aguilar suggested using Spanish surnames as a means of identifying the members of this group. While this might be somewhat inaccurate, it was the best approach possible given the circumstances.

In a monograph entitled Mexican/Chicano Concerns and School Desegregation in Los Angeles, UCLA Professor Carlos Haro supports Aguilar's assessment of the Hispanic community's reaction to dividing the group for desegreation purposes.

> The resentment of the community to...attempts to distinguish between assimilated and non-assimilated Chicanos has been pronounced.

One of the court experts, Gary Orfield, proposed such a policy of dividing the Hispanics. He also proposed to call Asians and Indians "mainstreamed" for the purpose of desegregation.[35]

While aware that the definition of a desegregated school in black-white terms only does not take into account the "special situation of tri-ethnic or multi-ethnic school districts", Orfield felt that all identifiable minority populations should not be included in the desegregated school definition as separate groups. The courts have been inconsistent, calling Hispanics "white" and integrating them with blacks in Houston and Miami and calling them a "victimized minority" in Denver. The courts have been largely unhelpful in dealing with Indian and Asian students. With regard to immigrant groups of various ethnic and linguistic backgrounds, Orfield finds that often they are only temporarily segregated. Using Italians, a white group, as an example, he says that the courts should not "disrupt a healthy process (of assimilation) by classifying the groups as a segregated minority." The key criteria, he feels, should be whether the group is as a whole segregated, doing poorly in school and unable to succeed economically and socially.

According to Orfield, Asians and Pacific Islanders are "not highly segregated and do not qualify as a segregated minority." Therefore, they should not be bused to desegregate white schools, but rather be considered "mainstream". Native Americans, generally dispersed in Los Angeles, are

nevertheless attending racially isolated schools which were not part of the plan as of 1978. He proposed that they also be considered "mainstream".

Hispanics in Los Angeles pose a greater problem. Orfield reported that one-fifth are highly segregated in East Los Angeles, the rest live in less segregated areas. Orfield proposes that one-tenth are well integrated culturally and economically; therefore, they should not be treated as one identifiable group. After quoting Hispanics who do not wish to differentiate among their own group, including symposium panelist Lynn Pineda, Orfield nevertheless proposed to consider some Hispanics "mainstream" and therefore not "presently harmed by segregation."[36]

Other Issues Raised in the Legal Perspectives Panel of the Symposium

Panelist Joe Duff, NAACP lawyer, felt that the issue of definition of "a segregated school" was central to a solution to the problem of desegregation in Los Angeles. He proposed that different levels of definition had been used by the courts in the past and asked social scientists to analyze these different levels.

On one level, desegregation has not focused on individual schools, but rather on "dual systems". This seemed to imply concern for analyzing a political and power process which creates inequality. On another level, racial isolation is discussed. The underlying emphasis here seems to be on the effect of a segregated environment on individual students and on society's goal to mainstream them into the opportunity structure. A third way of discussing this is to look at schools in terms of how they are perceived by the community, parents and the administration.

Duff was unable to get guidance on problems of definition from experts. He felt that social scientists, especially anthropologists, could provide some new thinking on these issues. As a lawyer in the case, he felt very frustrated by this issue. (While not discussed directly by the scholars, several comments were made on the scholar panel that were relevant to his concerns. These will be reported in a later section.)

Later, the symposium moderator, Edmund Gordon, asked Joe Duff if all of these difficulties in desegregating the schools suggest that there are limits to legal remedies. Duff agreed that the legal system is a difficult way to solve problems; however, given the failure of the political system to solve them, and especially the Board, the courts are the only way. "It's the only game we have", he said.

Cathy Davis, representing the ACLU on the symposium, supported Duff's perspective on the role of the court in that she carefully outlined the fact that the School Board had resisted desegregating the schools for more than fifteen years. A longtime member of the Southern California Education Committee of ACLU, and previously legal assistant to the lawyers in the case, Davis presented a dismal view of the School Board's intransigence which

continued over many years while segregation increased. She was particularly angry about how the Board treated the 100 citizens involved in CACSI, of which she was a member. This was later echoed by the participants on the Community Perspectives Panel. We "worked carefully and hard," she said. We could have desegregated the entire district, but the Board wouldn't help us or listen to us. Toward the end of the long, hard process, she said the Board hosted a reception for CACSI, but they wouldn't provide experts, data, or financial help. "Stubborn CACSI" met in people's homes to finish the plan. After Egly rejected the Board's "part-time learning center plan", she was designated by CACSI to monitor Board planning; however, according to Davis, planning took place behind the scenes. Instead of desegregating isolated minority students, she said the Board's priorities were "to protect white students from integration." (Further discussion on CACSI is included in the section on the Community Perspectives Panels.)

Another issue raised by a member of the audience during this panel was the possible impact of a metropolitan plan on bilingual education programs. Arias responded that even if other districts were brought in, some bilingual programs would still be in isolated settings. Analysis of some of the different processes of implementing bilingual programs in desegregated and integrated settings has been done by Carter and Segura , but much more data is needed on this issue. Under a Board agreement with the Office for Civil Rights on May 30, 1978, bilingual programs were supposed to be provided for limited English proficiency students, most of whom were Hispanic. Also, according to existing state law (A.B. 1329 Chacon-Moscone Bilingual Education Bill, 1976), the Board needed to assess students annually and provide them with bilingual education.

At the time of the symposium in 1978, there were 540 ESL teachers in Los Angeles serving 2,300 elementary and 2,130 secondary pupils. Vahac Mardirosian, another symposium panelist and Assistant to the Superintendent in Los Angeles for Hispanic Concerns, indicated privately that in 1978 there were 852 elementary teachers and 382 secondary teachers who could speak, read and write Spanish. He estimated that an additional 746 elementary teachers would be needed by 1980 to meet the Lau and State mandates. If a metropolitan plan were implemented, more teachers might be needed since more students may be in

integrated settings. Most Hispanics, however, felt that bilingual implementation at that time was so deficient that desegregation was just one more factor in weakening the program, he thought.

The Lau planning effort and bilingual education under state law were going on concurrently, but independently, of desegregation planning. However, in a district with such a large Hispanic population, and with many of these students limited in English, the meshing of these efforts with desegregation was necessary. Judge Egly realized this and asked Beatriz Arias to come up with some suggestions. Her ideas are similar to thos proposed by bilingual education advocates in other cities. They included clustering the Limited English Speaking/Non-English Speaking students in sufficient numbers to provide programs, providing needed staff, creating bilingual magnet schools in appropriate locations, dispersing Hispanics from the most isolated schools first, and informing and educating Hispanic parents about desegregation and magnet schools.

The Legal Perspectives Panel was one in which a high degree of frustration and anger were expressed. This had been a long battle and it was far from over. Most people on the panel had devoted many years of their lives to this case. Now, in 1978 they found themselves still involved. Even the basic issues of definition were still unresolved. The compromise plan that CACSI had worked out collaborately with whites, blacks, and Hispanics had been dismissed by the School Board, with little analysis and consideration. That Fall, many whites were boycotting the schools, and the Bustop group was still threatening to stop all mandatory efforts, though little real desegregation was taking place. One could sense the frustration, exhaustion, and anger as these lawyers presented to a new audience the problems they had worked on for so long. How long would they have to continue?

ADMINISTRATORS' PERSPECTIVES PANEL

While courts decide what is illegal, and school boards have the major responsibilities for policies, plans, and desegregation budgets, the teachers, principals and central office administrators ultimately have the job of bringing about changes in specific schools. Sometimes, these educators try to claim that they are not involved in "politics" and that as professionals they are "neutral" advocates for student needs. In the context of school desegregation cases that have gone on for years and years, and in communities polarized into groups for and against desegregation, this neutral stance is not realistic.

The three administrators who spoke during the symposium all recognized this fact and based their comments on who they are and how they have been involved in education in Los Angeles - as members of particular ethnic groups as well as persons with administrative responsibilities. They came across as human beings struggling with difficult change processes, deeply concerned and deeply committed to trying to find some positive strategies for change.

Vahac Mardirosian, though not ethnically Hispanic, has spent most of his life working with Hispanics, first in Mexico and then in Los Angeles. His theme was the need to recognize culturally-based competence and to destroy the labelling process that produces low achievement in children from minority groups. Al Moore, a black administrator, had spent a lifetime as an advocate for equal education for black children and saw the multiple societal forces that produce and maintain inequality. Stuart Bernstein, a Jewish-American administrator, mentioned the diversity of opinions among his ethnic group who were to be found in positions of power on all sides of the issue. He stressed the pain and complexity of coping with the pressures of politics, and with the demographic and the societal changes schools in L.A. are facing because of out of-school factors. Professionals need help, he said, in understanding and coping with these changes.

All of these administrators recognized the complexity of L.A. - the numbers of schools, the distances between them, the size of the budget - but all of them referred to what they perceived as problems common to all large cities in America. How unique are their perceptions and experiences? Surely, everyone's experiences are unique, yet these three people gave the audience insights that have wider applicability.

Vahac Mardirosian

The first presenter was Rev. Vahac Mardirosian who was working the Superintendent's Office as a spokesperson for Hispanic student needs. He had served on several Mexican-American groups concerned with education, including one which advised the Board, and several in the community which were concerned with Head Start and bilingual teacher training. He was respected by the community, though he was not Hispanic himself.

Rev. Mardirosian cared about achievement and felt strongly that something could be done to raise the achievement of Hispanic students. A good speaker, well prepared with charts and figures, he clearly made the audience aware of achievement differences between the most racially isolated schools and other schools. Rev. Mardirosian brought with him charts of the achievement scores of all elementary schools in the district. He asked the audience to look at those which were most segregated. In 1971 the children in such schools were reading at about the 3rd grade level when they were in the 6th grade. At that time he went, as a community member, to speak to the Board and to administrators and asked them, "How will these students be able to compete with other students in L.A.?" Their answers upset him. They said, "We have done everything we know how for them and we are good people. That's where they ended up." These students were low in ability and therefore they were not achieving, according to the administrators. The Chicano community offered to help. In 1978, only 28 out of 124 schools originally identified as "low achieving schools" have student populations performing below the 20th percentile, while 47 schools, formerly in this category, have been able to raise student achievement to the 40 - 60 percentile range.

To Rev. Mardirosian, one of the major problems with segregation is what it does to teachers' perceptions of student ability. "Part of segregation is in people's heads," he said. They conceptualize minority pupils as unequal and see them as fitting into certain categories. They do not know or respect the competencies children bring with them to school, the things that they can do "in their natural habitat". They label the child "disadvantaged" and soon he also believes this is true. He said teachers do not find out that the five year old child who goes to school takes care of his two year old brother or sister, washes dishes, and can do many household chores.

The fact that community members got involved, and that change is possible was emphasized by this speaker. We have a new idea, he says: "Si se pueda". In other words, the district is capable of bringing about change, but it has to want to do so.

Al Moore

Al Moore, black civil rights advocate and administrator, does not perceive the major problem as one of labelling, but rather as one of years of illegal and unfortunate actions on the part of officials at all levels of government that have created segregation and maintained it. While at the time of the symposium he was an administrative consultant to the staff development branch of the District, he told the audience of his involvement as a black community leader for many years. He worked with five NAACP chapters, was a member of the first task force on desegregation for the district, and was president of the Council of Black Administrators, which had drafted a desegregation position paper and had given this to the court last year.

Al Moore admitted that he was speaking to the symposium audience as a long-time advocate for civil rights and as a person who had lived for many years in L.A. He felt that L.A. was not unique but rather reflected processes that exist in every city - the legal and financial factors that lead to segregation, and the community racism that maintains it. According to Moore, federal FHA policies, the development of freeways that displaced minorities, and moved whites outward to the suburbs, and the policies of banks and insurance companies, all contributed to the creation of segregated urban areas. He continued with an historical review of what happened in L.A., including the riots in Watts in 1965, the spreading of the black and Hispanic segregated areas to other contiguous areas, and the current fact that many Hispanics were moving into areas in the black community. He told of policies that placed black teachers in black schools. Then, finally, there was a recognition, in the 1960's, that "there was a line like a Berlin Wall" between the black and white communities. A case was filed in court.

Moore saw the current L.A. situation as one in which the political power is in the hands of the conservative white population because they are more numerous and can elect Board members who are against desegregation. Once,

forty years ago, a black woman "accidentally" was elected to the School Board, he said, so they changed to at-large elections to retain the power. (He referred to a major reversal of this policy just a week prior to the symposium when it was decided that certain parts of the city would elect Board members.) The white community was basically conservative, except for some liberal Jewish-Americans. This was true of many groups in the community, but there were also pro-integration forces who were for equal access. Those who were conservative and against desegregation had more power and tried to develop a plan which would, in effect, leave many racially isolated schools out of the plan. Therefore, the courts were the only possible way to go to gain equal opportunity.

The opinions of the expert witnesses were not so different from the opinions of the black pro-desegregation leaders. Moore's group, the Council of Black Administrators, had presented similar ideas to the court, he said.

According to Moore, history clearly indicates that conservative whites with power in political and economic institutions controlled the creation of the segregated barrios and ghettos of L.A., and conservative whites who have the power of the School Board continue to maintain segregation. Unless this changes, little real desegregation will take place.

Stuart Bernstein

Stuart Bernstein knows the complexities of schools in cities, both in New York City and in L.A. where he had served as a principal of a predominantly minority school (originally 88 percent black and 12 percent Hispanic; then, in five years, 60 percent Hispanic and 40 percent black). In 1978 as an administrator in the Office of School Integration, he expressed his belief that what was happening in L.A. "mirrored" what was happening in other cities. Broader demographic and social changes were taking place, and perhaps the schools alone could not be expected to cope with all these changes.

Courts may not be the best way to solve urban problems, according to Berstein. While he agreed with Joe Duff that sometimes "it is the only game we have," he also mentioned how slow and difficult it is to get the courts to act and how inconsistent court decisions can be. Meanwhile, major changes take place in the society.

One of the things that changes over time is the political climate in the community. While the 1960's allowed for some responsiveness, the 1970's are very conservative. Fifteen years later, L.A. is not only more complex due to the increasing ethnic and minority student populations, but also the political climate is even more resistant to change.

The opinions of people in the city vary greatly, according to Bernstein, and the intra-ethnic groups diversity should also be recognized. "We don't have a black community," he said, "we have black communities." This is true for the Hispanic groups and for the white group. He took the Jewish-American group as an example and listed the individuals of Jewish background who were involved at all levels - the court, the board, the administration and the community. They reflected diverse opinions.

The Board itself has changed, according to Berstein. While he did not apologize for the conservative nature of the Board, he did stress the pressures put on Board members by their various constituencies. "Come and see a Board meeting," he urged; "it's the greatest show in town." There are numerous people carrying signs and wearing buttons indicating their opinions on the issues to be discussed. Perhaps, our expectations of such Boards as problem-solving mechanisms are too high. "We expect Board members to have the patience of Job and the wisdom of Solomon. This may not be fair."

In order to cope with the changes in society as they are reflected in school problems, Berstein asked that people consider the role other institutions such as the family and the church need to play. "How can we realistically expect the American public school to carry on by itself that job of socialization. It is going to need help."

Administrators and teachers also need help, he said. Since there is no agreement by the "power brokers" about the goal of better education for all students, the staff has to try to have a high degree of professionalism and assistance to handle changes in school population. The enormity of the problem creates difficulties for those who must carry out desegregation plans. Berstein made a personal plea to the audience, asking for their help.

> I ask your help. Help those of us who are charged with implementing the court order for desegregation to interpret the kinds of stresses we are undergoing. Perhaps in understanding the stress, we can work together to find solutions.

In conclusion, each administrator saw the problems associated with desegregation somewhat differently because of his experiences and perhaps also because of his own knowledge of the diversity within his own ethnic group. Each saw forces that they could not control, but that had to be given consideration - teacher attitudes and expectations, the power of white community and business leaders, and demographic and societal changes that were taking place in all large cities. All three individuals came across as individuals who cared about equal access and were quite frustrated by the lack of societal consensus needed in order to bring it about.

COMMUNITY PERSPECTIVES PANEL

While desegregation is usually the result of litigation on behalf of minority plaintiffs, minority involvement in the actual planning for desegregation is often limited. Judges, lawyers, school board members, politicians, administrators, and experts raise issues, make pronouncements, and get their views before the public through the press and T.V. far more often than do black, Hispanic or Asian community leaders and parents. Definitions of "a desegregated school", and "who is a minority" are discussed by people who may not understand the perspectives of the parents and children on whose behalf a remedy is being fashioned. While there are efforts to involve citizen's groups, these are often frustrating expercises that are later ignored by School Board members as they develop their own plan.

Our panel members expressed the view that their perspectives were really not often heard, understood or publicized during the desegregation process by those who had greater power to shape the issues - the media, the Board members, the administration and the court-appointed experts. Our panelists were black, Hispanic and Asian and all had been active in trying to bring about positive efforts to desegregate the schools. While they admitted that they learned much from their efforts, they were frustrated that the white majority, which controls the schools, had not really paid attention to their concerns. Each in his or her own way spoke about some kind of "invisible curtain" that seemed to separate their reality from that perceived to be true by whites. Aware that change would not be easily accomplished, they seemed resigned to a continuation of racial and ethnic isolation and discrimination during their lifetime. Attitudes and perceptions on the part of the white majority would have to change if their needs were to be recognized, understood and really addressed.

Pat Benson

The first panelist, Pat Benson, was a black parent active in educational issues first in Rochester, New York, and more recently in Los Angeles. As Director of Education of the Afro-American Cultural Education Center and as a parent having served on the California Task Force on Integrated Education, Pat Benson stressed some of the real concerns black parents have for how discipline is administered, how black parents are informed and educated about

school matters, how human relations training is carried out, and how low achievement is handled. These issues do not get publicized and reported by the media during desegregation, according to Benson. Rather, media coverage is likely to involve scare headlines about "White Flight" which has the result of bolstering opposition to desegregation and paving the way for conservative candidates to get elected to school boards. She called this "blood and guts" reporting. "That kind of journalism makes money," she said. "It does not educate the public about pre-desegregation birth rates, housing and employment trends, and other long-term factors." If only a few schools experience violence, like in Boston, these get the coverage - not the other schools which remain peaceful. Though Benson felt the ethnic press did a better job of covering some of the positive stories, on the whole the issues of concern to black parents were not as well publicized as the statements of white anti-busing leaders.

> One rarely hears that minority children are overwhelmingly the recipients of disciplinary action, suspensions and expulsions in desegrated schools. Why were 604 minority students out of 864 total students, in the city of Pasadena, suspended from school in an 18-month period from September 1975 to January 1976?

On the whole, according to the U.S. Civil Rights Commission hearings on desegregation in Los Angeles in December 1977, media coverage in Los Angeles was generally reasonable. However, reporters present at the hearings admitted that they couldn't seem to follow the deliberations of the Citizen's Advisory Committee on Student Integration (CACSI) well enough to cover their planning efforts. Thus, while reporters did go on trips with School Board members visiting schools in other cities to get ideas for desegregation, they couldn't adequately cover the Board-appointed local committee charged with developing a plan. According to the Civil Rights Commission Report:

> The media's frustration in covering this complex issue is that so much of the work is done at the sub-committee level and when the general committee meetings are held, there are a lot of viewpoints to be heard...[37]

These CACSI member viewpoints represented different segments of the majority and minority community who were trying to compromise and collaborate to bring about fairly extensive desegregation. While it may have been complex

for the media to cover, it probably represented the key to bringing about public recognition and support for change. Those against change and willing to stand firm behind a slogan of "anti-busing" made the news. Instead of playing a public educational role, clarifying perspectives, and building support for compromise, media coverage was often focused on those intent on defying the court.

Annie Richardson

Parents who did participate in the CACSI effort learned that they needed help to accomplish what they set out to do and that they could be ignored and used by a Board which did not want to change. Annie Richardson, a black parent and community leader who served on CACSI, told of her excitement as she began the year and a half effort of meetings to develop a desegregation plan. "We saw this as a chance to improve the quality of education for our children!" She was proud that the group did indeed write a plan, even without the assistance of experts. This planning involved many parents and did propose to desegregate 145 schools which were racially isolated. Groups were formed and meetings held. She recognized some weaknesses - "we didn't know what others were doing" - but felt that somehow "all the little plans fit together."

The community cared about quality education and integration and a plan that would improve schools for all the students, but the Board did not seem interested. Over the summer, major changes were made by the Board without parental involvement. A "mid-site" idea was adopted to try to shorten bus rides. The Board said it wanted to do things differently; it didn't want very much mandatory assignment. "All of this had to look voluntary," according to Richardson. Just before school was to start, the Board developed its own plan in a very short period of time, a plan she felt was very inadequate.

As Annie Richardson put it, "When the buses rolled on that September 12th, and headlines across the country said L.A. desegregation was peaceful, this was true. But, very little integration took place, too."

The plan did not place the burden of movement fairly on all students. Ninety-eight percent of those involved in the Permit with Transportation Program were black and Hispanic students. Also, those left behind found themselves still in a school district "more segregated than any that ever existed in the South" and the quality of education concerns of parents were not included. Why don't people in Los Angeles recognize this segrgation? Annie Richardson said:

> The problem here is that most people don't realize how segregated it is because they have been living behind the invisible racial isolation curtain all their lives. That they don't realize that there is a whole other world on the other side of Central Avenue - the main boulevard of the black community. There are lots of students that grow up and never go across that boulevard.

Annie Richardson compared the feelings of growing up black in the South with Los Angeles:

> In the South, you knew what Jim Crow meant. Here you are in the invisible wall of racial isolation. Here you are under the illusion that you have what you need until you get out of school and you come to apply for a job and you say I graduated from Jordan High School and the interviewer says, oh well, that's a Jordan kid there.

She felt that when black students are educated behind these walls, they are identified forever as being inferior. "Anyone who is familiar with Los Angeles knows people expect Jordan graduates or Locke graduates to be inferior to Granada Hills or Grant." Until there is acceptance of the fact that there is an invisible wall between groups, desegregation and equal opportunity cannot be accomplished, she felt. Even in desegregated settings, the separation of the races will continue. "The current plan in Los Angeles doesn't begin to destroy the wall."

Asian and Hispanic parent participants also felt that they were not understood by others. To Marvin Tom, the Asian panelist, being Asian meant somehow being "invisible". Even if some Asians were able to integrate with whites more than blacks or Hispanics were able to do so, they were not accepted <u>as Asians</u>.

Why are Asians "invisible"? asked Marvin Tom, an active member of a pro-integration community research group. The answer was not so much white America's unwillingness to deal with race, as it was its inability to accept cultural differences. Even the category used - "Asian/Pacific Islander" - shows this inability to recognize the diversity of Asian cultural groups. At least ten different groups were considered to be one group which fit this designation, according to Tom. Small numbers, he felt, were not the real reason for this invisibility. Rather, it was the fact that cultural differences are not really "allowed to be seen." Asians are viewed as "foreigners" in America, according to Tom.

Marvin Tom was not pleased that 5 out of 8 of the court-appointed experts recommended defining Asians as white or "mainstreamers". To him, this showed a lack of knowledge of Asian people and their diversity. While some Asians, especially many Chinese and Japanese people have relatively high incomes, and many of them are dispersed among the white population, these represent only a small part of the diversity within the Asian community. Even if one looks at the status of these individuals, it is possible to see discrimination and limits on their ability to gain decision-making positions. Also, just on cultural grounds, "To say I am semi-white is ridiculous." Little is known by whites about the Asian-American experience.

Ruby Aguilar

The Mexican-American community is also diverse and includes recent immigrants from Mexico and those living in Los Angeles for many generations. Ruby Aguilar, Business Director of the Hispanic Urban Center and a member of the court-appointed monitoring committee on racially isolated schools, was concerned about the negative stereotype that exists for all members of this group. There are different concerns about desegregation in different segments of this community, according to Aguilar.

To emphasize the effect of a general negative stereotype, Ruby Aguilar told of an incident in which a police officer beat a man who couldn't understand English whom he thought was Mexican-American. When he learned that the person was from a Central American country, he stopped and apologized.

"If you look like a Mexican, you are treated like a 'dirty Mexican'," Aguilar said. Also, unlike other minority groups, the apparent trappings of higher social status, like dress, often doesn't prevent harassment by immigration officials in Los Angeles.

While Ruby Aguilar recognized the diversity within the Hispanic community, she was unwilling to have the judge, court experts, or others define some Hispanics as "mainstreamers".

Aguilar felt that new Mexican immigrants who are bused may experience difficulties with value conflicts that are likely to occur as children are exposed to different life styles. She especially is concerned about the behavior of young girls who may wish to copy non-Hispanic values and may start putting on make-up and acting differently on the bus to school. Changes may occur that "go deeper" than that, Ruby Aguilar said, and nobody is looking at that.

As a parent, Ruby Aguilar is concerned that her children will probably never escape from a racially isolated upbringing. She is not happy about that. Even after this limited desegregation effort, hundreds of thousands of children will remain racially isolated. What will this mean for them? What will they get in terms of quality education - those who are left behind while resources go for desegregation and are dwindling?

Bilingual Education is also a concern of Ruby Aguilar. She can't understand why so many view it as somehow "un-American" when in Europe many languages are spoken and this is accepted.

In answer to the question she often gets from blacks as to why Mexican-Americans seem to have "sat back for all these years" rather than fight for equality, she replied - "a tree that falls in the forest still makes noise even if there is nobody there to hear it."

Thus, the representatives of the minority communities each felt that diversity within their communities was not adequately recognized by the white society. This was, according to one panelist, due to the control by whites of

the decision-making positions and the media. Others stressed the negative attitudes which were blinding the perceptions of whites and hurting the minority communities. All panelists seemed to recognize an "invisible barrier" of racial isolation which not only was very extensive in Los Angeles, but would also be likely to continue for generations.

SCHOLARS' PERSPECTIVES PANEL

Rae Alexander-Minter provided an historical overview of the development of the relatively new field of educational anthropology. This field, approximately a decade old, uses a range of methods for observing and recording behavior in naturalistic settings to provide a disciplined way of describing the points of view of people, how they see reality. It also attempts to provide a holistic perspective to provide others with a more accurate picture of what is happening. That was what the various panels on the first day of the symposium attempted to do. Participants were selected to present a range of views and ethnicities. This was true of the Scholars Perspectives Panel as well, which included white, black and Hispanic scholars with different perspectives on how anthropology can contribute to a study of school desegregation.

St. Clair Drake

The first participant on this panel, St. Clair Drake, a prominant black anthropologist, reinforced Alexander-Minter's opening remarks about the nature of ethnography and the structure of this symposium. He said he was grateful that he had had the unforgetable experiences listening to those from Los Angeles.

While he disclaimed being an "expert", he shared his reflections on having lived for 23 years in what has often been called the most segregated city in the United States, Chicago. St. Clair Drake is best known for his work on that city, Black Metropolis, but has also done field work in Africa, the West Indies and a multi-ethnic, multi-racial community in Wales. St. Clair Drake feels that the primary function of anthropology is to help people understand themselves by documenting what happens. In addition, anthropologists can assess situations and perhaps find ways as to bring people together rather than polarize them. Margaret Mead, who died during the week of this symposium, was praised for her abilities, not only as a superb ethnographer, but also as a mediator. Sol Tax, who created the term "action anthropology" also pioneered the more activist role of anthropologist as one who helps people realize their goals. As an anthropologist participating in this symposium, Drake saw himself as one who had listened to the questions and problems of others and who could respond in terms of both his own personal

experiences as well as his professional training. He provided an historical perspective, and made specific suggestions for research that ethnographers could carry out.

According to Drake, the years 1955 through 1966 constituted "The Desegregation Decade." It took place primarily in the South. "Through non-violent positive action they (blacks) won what was, in effect a revolution and destroyed the caste system in the South. This was followed by a recognition of certain Northern facts - large ghettos with inadequate schooling and housing, extremely high unemployment rates for black youth, widespread residential segregation and what came to be called 'institutional racism'." The riots followed first in the East in 1954, then in Watts in 1965, in Chicago and the East in 1966, and all over the nation in 1967. Youth movements developed - the Black Power, Brown Power and Red Power movements - asking for control of resources as a first priority.

> Many and perhaps most of the older leaders felt that some "mix" between maintaining ethnic institutions seeking improvement and "integration" would have to evolve in America and that educational planning should involve both the strengthening of schools in ghettos and barrios and the continued attempt to desegregate the vast urban school systems that did not fit children to live in a pluralistic society.

Thirteen years have passed since the time Drake has called "The Desegregation Decade." Little desegregation has occurred. He feels ethnography can help us to understand why this has been so.

First of all, St. Clair Drake urged anthropologists and others to learn from the adaptability of children. While patterns of acceptance by white and minority children have taken place, adults have been threatened and have attempted to prevent cross-ethnic and cross-racial friendships. We need to learn from children. He said,

> I am concerned that the children have a great deal to teach us about the desegregation process if we will only look and listen. The participant-observation techniques of the ethnographers provide us with efficient well-tested tools for gaining this kind of understanding.

St. Clair Drake praised the observational studies that have recently been undertaken in individual desegregated schools and asked that some thought be provided to studies of students on buses. He referred to comments by Ruby Aguilar of the Community Perspective Panel, on student behavior on buses.

> I think that a full ethnographic account of the desegregation process would involve participant-observation in bus riding, with anthropologists documenting both the speech and the non-verbal behavior of the children in transit and at pick-ups and discharge points, as well as their interaction with adults who happen to be riding.

After studying prejudice and discrimination for nearly 50 years, Drake feels that problems would disappear if older people would leave youth alone. At any rate, "all of us need to know what the process looks like through youthful eyes..."

Next, St. Clair Drake addressed the issue of the "melting pot". He reviewed the attitudes underlying assimilation and two influential books on the topic, one by Glazer and Moynihan and one by Milton Gordon which deal with the realities of ethnic group identity and its presence in America. The decline of the myth of the melting pot and the rise of the "power" movements came just as there was a drive for desegregation in the North. This led to a split within ethnic communities into those who wanted more desegregation and those who wanted to focus on improving ghetto schools. According to Drake, most leaders supported a "mix" of both strategies. Quoting a statement he wrote in a book in 1971, Drake summarized the need to understand the new "mix" of problems that are emerging as our society changed in the 70's.

> One of the ongoing processes during the 1970's will be the evolution of new patterns of interracial behavior consistant with a pluralism that preserves group identity without destroying freedom of association and collaboration lines.[38]

It is possible that anthropologists can study the dynamics of this new pluralism - its meanings for different people within the various ethnic groups and its impact on relationships.

We need to better understand ethnic group variance according to Drake. "The emphasis in ethnicity studies," he said, "is on understanding the manner in which ethnic identification is used in various types of social institutions." In a complex society like Los Angeles, anthropologists could assist in not only helping provide understanding about how ethnic groups and their subgroups identify themselves, and how they interact with the white society, but also how the various minority groups interact with each other. Anthropologists may be able to help.

What people call themselves is important and linked to values. Responding to the Hispanic community panelists who raised issues of within ethnic group diversity, St. Clair Drake gave examples from the black experience of the changes that have taken place in preferred ways of referring to the group and the meaning this has had for those involved. While asserting "that ethnic groups have the right to decide what they want to be called," he recognized that there is often disagreement within these groups.

> Anthropologists may have some guidance to offer on this question of nomenculture, but of more relavence to our specific theme, we need ethnographic reporting upon what young people of various ethnic groups call each other in varied contexts, and what they consider perjorative and how changing evaluations are being placed upon ethnic designators, if they are.

St. Clair Drake stressed that no matter what various people in the different ethnic groups do call themselves, they will find that they are living in two worlds for many years to come - their "intimate ethnic world of family and close friends and fellow members of voluntary associations and the inter-ethnic, inter-racial worlds of work and politics."

> A successful life, and an enjoyable life, will depend upon the ability to move backward and forward between these two worlds with ease.

Living in two worlds is a natural consequence of "third world" people who are rooted in their own ethnic identity, but who need to cooperate and compete with people of different ethnic identities. Since schools are a microcosm of society, we need ethnographic studies of how children live in their two worlds

and solve problems. How does the administration of a school facilitate student learning about how to live in a pluralistic society without undue strain? Los Angeles' desegregated schools could provide an opportunity for us to study how this can be done. However, it may mean some new approaches are needed, like requiring all children to learn both Spanish and English.

In concluding, Drake stressed that there are a variety of ways ethnographers could contribute to our understanding of school desegregation. First of all, they can supply data to be interpreted by themselves and others. They could, secondly, be "trouble shooters" and "resource persons" at meetings where policy is being formulated and research being designed related to planning and evaluation. The ideal situation, he thought, would be one in which an advisory panel could be attached to the research unit of the district administration. This panel should include anthropologists from each of the major ethnic groups involved if possible. At least one full-time socio-cultural anthropologist would be necessary to design and coordinate the various ethnographic studies. Since desegregation involves culture contact, a key concern of the discipline of anthropology, it is appropriate that they, along with psychologists and sociologists, be involved in these roles.

Some additional areas for research were mentioned briefly by Drake: 1) how to bring the isolated ethnic school in contact with other types of schools; 2) how student attitude change may affect parents and siblings in minority and white families; 3) what is the process of "resegregation", and 4) how are conflicts in values and loyalties experienced and resolved by children.

Edmund W. Gordon

Edmund W. Gordon, a black educator and psychologist who has been a long time prominant figure in the effort to reform educational policy to provide equality for black students was the next presenter. He has written on the efforts of the past twenty years and has provided thoughtful synthesis and reanalysis of what is known and what needs to be known to adequately address the need for school reform in light of the diversity of student experiences and characteristics. In addition to his excellent efforts as moderator of the symposium's first day, Gordon made a presentation as part of the Scholars' Panel.

Gordon expressed his view that the symposium was helpful in providing a forum for different perceptions and meanings in the context of real life situations. Facts, he said, were not enough; meanings were also important. Sometimes, in race relations, we do not examine the human dimensions that are part of people working together in racially mixed groups. "What meanings do people bring to these situations and what are they taking away?" Even a "perfect" desegregation plan will not necessarily affect people's different perspectives and meanings.

Often we focus on "form" and forget about "substance". This may lead to resegregation in desegregated settings, to overt and covert isolation. To equalize status and access, we look toward desegregation, yet it may not be the only or most appropriate method to achieve the purpose of desegregation which is status equalization. "Integration may flow better from conditions of strength than from positions of weakness." To the extent that desegregation contributes to status equalization, Gordon supports it fully. However, another route to social justice may be concerned with the sufficiency of distribution of the nation's resources and power to blacks to achieve a greater sense of status equalization.

According to Gordon, one can use the categories of "status" - sex, language and race - as key factors to discuss equality, or one can focus on "functional" characteristics - motivation, aspirations, cognitive styles and language use for learning. He asked, "Do these functional characteristics give us better levers for organizing the resources for people for developmental facilitation than status characteristics? Which way of thinking will help us to improve the teacher-learner situation?" he asked. He answered his own question.

> Status tells something about how society sees a person and society must address these issues, but it may not tell us too much about education.

In a published article,[39] Gordon discussed these same ideas. He discussed the diversity within the various ethnic groups of those traditionally "less well-served by our educational systems." Like those who had shared their concerns in our symposium's Community Perspectives Panel,

Gordon emphasized within group diversity. The psychological question, according to Gordon is

> What do the special characteristics of this person or group of persons require of the intervening process to enable this person to function with adequacy and satisfaction?

Gordon asked that there be a shift to qualitative approaches of research so that we can understand how teachers can and do fit instruction to the characterisics of different pupils.

It appears, from Gordon's presentation, that there are appropriate foci for anthropologists which include describing within ethnic group diversity as it affects meanings, values and learning in school, as well as describing the realities of intergroup relations in desegregated settings in regard to status equalization.

John Ogbu

John Ogbu, a Nigerian anthropologist, urged conference participants to look beyond the classroom for answers to what will make desegregation work for minorities. In his book,[40] Ogbu has stressed the need to start with the historical, economic, and social realities of a community to achieve an understanding of race and education. The historical and contemporary analysis of relationships between groups can then be linked to classroom realities. Anthropologists can make a contribution to our understanding of the educational performance of minority students in segregated and desegregated settings if they explore the consequences of social stratification on students' aspirations and coping mechanisms and on teachers' behaviors.

The ultimate goal of socialization both in the home and in the school is to prepare children to become competent adults. According to Ogbu, school failure of black and other minority students may be a kind of adaptation, inside and outside of the school, to the low educational and skill requirements for blacks due to their more or less ascribed social and economic roles in adult life. In his words:[41]

> Even very young black children - and American Indian, Mexican-American and Puerto Rican children - pick up discouraging but quite realistic messages about the comparatively poor

> pay-off that education is likely to have for them. They live everyday surrounded by adults whose education is connected only dimly to their jobs, or who cannot find jobs at all.

According to Ogbu, the socialization practices of subordinate minorities should be studied in light of the different competencies these groups perceive as important for survival. These competencies are related to the participation of adults in the political and economic aspects of that society. The lack of access to high status occupational roles means that different kinds of child-rearing practices are developed which are functional for their children.

Ogbu would seek to interpret processes in schools and classrooms in terms of an understanding of the opportunity structure of a community. He feels that the teachers teach black children to develop in ways that probably reflect the teachers' views of social competencies that they associate with the adult black community. Ogbu refers to Leacock's study[42] of fifth grade classrooms in schools with different social class populations. The degree of real responsibility given students seemed to reflect the social class status of the pupils.

Ogbu urged researchers interested in desegregation to take a holistic view of the problems of minority children and not to just focus on desegregated classrooms. As he had said,

> Every study of education or schooling in a given society ought also to be part of the study of that society - how that society is structured or organized for social action and how it works.[43]

In studying schools and society, John Ogbu told symposium participants that his experiences in working on desegregation issues in Stockton, California reinforced his view that while microethnographic studies are good, they cannot explain a lot of things that go on in the classroom as well as in the broader society. He would suggest that the place to begin a study of schooling in a given community is in that community rather than in a classroom, learning the structure of that community. He would like to see a combination of microethnography and macroethnography in desegregation studies. In order to understand teachers' behaviors and student responses,

Ogbu recommends that scholars study the processes emanating from the historical relationships between groups. Only then can one understand why school-based change programs may fail.

Ogbu gave a few examples from his own research in Stockton. First, he said that when he heard the symposium participants last night discuss problems with citizen's committees, this was indeed a familiar problem to him. He spoke of the "absurdity of citizen's committees and public hearings" because their findings and recommendations are so often, in the final analysis, ignored. Using the term "performance government", he said that those who have power let citizens "perform", then they themselves make decisions. This may not be clear to anthropologists unless they take a look at the political processes in the community and compare what people say and what they do.

Ogbu recalls meeting people in Stockton who were running for the school board and who would say that they wanted to provide blacks with quality education without busing. "Good education will lead to good jobs," these people would say. However, these same people opposed job opportunity programs and integrated housing.

People in the school system in Stockton told Ogbu that they had tried everything to improve the achievement scores of black students - enrichment, smaller classes, and so on. However, after five months there, he realized that minority people felt that they were not treated fairly in the broader society. He documented discrimination in the job market and attended city council meetings when statistics were provided on discrimination. Then, when he observed in the schools, he felt he could understand why children were not achieving.

In conclusion, Ogbu said that a holistic ethnography of education needs to consider the adult social and oppoortunity structure as well as interactions in the classroom and on the playground. In addition, he called for a greater concern for theory development so we can make sense of the data collected.

Henry Torres Trueba

Symposium participant Henry T. Trueba, a Chicano scholar active in the field of bilingual education, took his own field of anthropology to task for not recruiting and supporting more minority group anthropologists. To him, understanding and defining issues like desegregation requires greater participation of minority scholars. The fact that there are so few black and Chicano educational anthropologists does affect the research produced. "We have been an obstacle to ethnic scholars in our own field," he said. "There is a lot of cleaning up to do at home."

One of the values of a symposium like the one reported here is that it enables minority scholars to present their perspective to others, including scholars from other minority groups. A number of minority scholars were in the audience listening to Dr. Trueba's comments - blacks, Asians and Hispanics. While the Council on Anthropology and Education has been responsive to the interests of minority scholars, and the National Institute for Education has developed special programs to support minority scholars and women, these efforts are fairly recent and small. According to Henry T. Trueba, 'We anthropologists have practiced segregation in our own field."

Minority scholars and Anglo scholars interested in improving educational opportunities for linguistic minority children have recently undertaken classroom studies of language use. Some of these studies are reported in a book Henry T. Trueba has edited (along with Grace Pung Guthrie and Kathryn Hu-Pei Au) called Culture and the Bilingual Classroom: Studies in Classroom Ethnography, soon to be published (1980) by Newbury House.[44]

Trueba referred to these classroom studies as possible examples of what could be done in studies of desegregated settings. In microethnographic studies, he said, one is "slowing down the processes of interaction so that we can actually see processes of discrimination." Some of these studies have utilized video taped analysis which allows for the coding of non-verbal as well as verbal behavior." Trueba feels that these studies are very valuable. If teachers are "talking down" to students in ways that are demeaning, this can actually be shown.

Finally, Trueba reminded the audience that multicultural education should not deal with just black and white interaction. National origin groups with languages other than English number over 25 million. They should be included in any research on desegregation. Particularly, the size of the Hispanic population cannot be ignored. Trueba closed his comments with the following:

> It is about time we began to cope with what this society is all about and what multicultural education is all about.

Los Angeles was a most appropriate place to make this statement.

In other papers and presentations by Henry T. Trueba, the potential contributions of anthropology, particularly ethnography, to a study of bilingual education has been stressed. In a paper presented at The American Anthropological Association in 1976 entitled "Research Needs in Bilingual Education: Can the Science of Culture Help?", Trueba spelled out some ways in which anthropologists could be helpful to bilingual education. Many of these thoughts are applicable to the study of desegregation as well.

There are three areas in which ethnographic research can make a substantial contribution to the understanding, organization, and implementation of bilingual education programs; 1) in planning; 2) in the study of the process of bilingual instruction and 3) in long-range evaluation. According to Trueba, programs are often designed by people unfamiliar with the culture of the children who are eligible for them. They do not know the social context surrounding children in school and in the community - including the use of language in the home, economic, political and educational characteristics of the children's families and the community served by the school. Anthropologists could offer a conceptional framework for understanding the social behavior of children, the roots of their cultural identity and how they function within their own cultural milieu. Then it would be possible to examine the consequences of imposing a forced immersion into a strange milieu. According to Trueba, this information is needed in order to really understand how the children are doing in school.

> It is simply inconceivable to assess the potential achievement of children in a bilingual program without being familiar with what the children bring with themselves to school: family life, cultural and physical survival skills, roles and obligations, world views, sources of self-esteem, and health and general welfare.

Trueba recommends looking at the congruence between the school environment and the community environment. While for some children a lack of congruence may not be extremely harmful, for others it is extremely so; they not only lose their ability to communicate with their families, but also become alienated and lose interest in school.

Dorothy C. Clement

The next participant, Dorothy Clement, reviewed her results from two years of observation in a desegregated school. Clement's research focused on 125 fifth and sixth grade students in an elementary school that was 65 percent black and located in a Southern industrial city of approximately 100,000 people. Her focus in this NIE funded study was on the social relationships between black and white students and the behavior of the black and white staff in controlling and fostering these social relationships. As she said to the symposium participants, her anthropological research allowed her to view how a school reorganized to adapt to the presence of racial diversity.

The general question that emerged from her presentation is a significant one and merits further research by anthropologists. Clement asked, "We know how to be apart, but do we know anything about being together?" She said that Americans know more about prejudicial treatment and discrimination than they do about how to foster positive inter-racial friendships.

This is indeed true and permeates much of the research and thinking that has emerged out of desegregation. We tend to focus more on conflict resolution and issues of potential harm than on documenting positive strategies for building good black and white relationships. Recent efforts by Hawley, et.al., (1980),[45] which involve retrieval by interviews of positive desegregation strategies is a good idea; however, his study will not provide us with ethnographic documentation of classroom level strategies which foster

cross-racial communication. Research by Elizabeth Cohen at Stanford on status-equalization tasks, and research coming out of Slavin's Johns Hopkins studies, are also related to this question of the need to learn how to foster positive relationships.[46]

According to Clement, in our society we do not have models for positive interaction across race and ethnic lines. In the school she studied, children were taught to be polite to one another, and to avoid divisiveness, but not how to develop positive relationships. Students were informally segregated and there were certain areas in the school they used to interact with friends of the same color. Many of their attempts at cross-race friendships failed. Cultural differences in styles of communication, such as different reactions to insults, caused miscommunications between students.

In a previous paper by Clement on her research, she stressed the role of the staff at this school. Black and white teachers gave very little explicit attention to the issue of race. They did not discuss it except in response to specfic student questions and during Black History Week.

> Most of the white teachers...seem to prefer to deal with social race relations only after they have been pushed to the foreground by students.

Few materials or bulletin board displays emphasized race. Teachers seemed to feel that race was to be denied as a factor in human relationships. When occasionally cultural differences were raised by students, such as when a white student was confused by black funeral customs, the white teachers showed that they were themselves ignorant of black customs.

As in most school situations, the major emphasis seemed to be conflict avoidance. Clement commented on how the teachers tried to get students to be polite. She called this a norm of "polite cooperation." Black and whites in school, both staff and students, for the most part behaved politely to one another. However, few cross-race relationships were formed by either group.

In this paper on the staff interactions mentioned above, Clement referred to an ethnographic study done by Kimball and Wagley in Florida.[48] They felt that race relationships have changed in the South from a model of "unequal but

intimate relationships to one of more equal but distant relations." Clement seems to agree. Thus, desegregated Southern schools may be producing a polite and controlled setting for cross-race interaction, but no real sharing of perspectives, and no friendships. The tensions of race relations in the society at large will probably not be resolved by such approaches to desegregating shcools. They are a "safe area", "a truce", not an effective way to build a pluralistic society.

In her symposium presentation, Clement said that there was little real exchange between blacks and whites - little sharing of perspectives, problems, or social customs - among either adults or children in the desegregated school she studied. She ended her presentation by saying that more emphasis is needed in ethnographic research on what can produce positive exchanges. It is not surprising to her that students didn't come up with new patterns by themselves. Also, the teachers had little support to try new things and communicate these to their peers. They have little power and few resources.

Michael Stolee

Michael Stolee, Dean of the School of Education at the University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee, and a desegregation planner with experience in many school desegregation cases, raised some important questions that he felt anthropologists should try to address. First, Stolee asked that some research effort go into studying white diversity and concerns. He said, "Why really do white parents oppose sending their children to non-white neighborhoods?" For the burden of desegregation to be equitable, busing of white students as well as black students is needed; however, it is often assumed that extensive two-way busing will not work and more blacks are bused to white schools. What are the fears of white parents? Is it crime? White parents should be interviewed and data made available on what they believe and why, if desegregation is to work.

Next, Stolee raised some difficult questions about how the goals of acculturation or cultural pluralism are transmitted in different school settings. Specifically, he stressed the need to examine inter-group relationships within these settings. However, he also said that it was not clear to him whether schools could, or should, have an effect on the broader societal goals of accultruation or pluralism.

Addressing the specific Los Angeles problems of the definition of a desegregated school, as raised by symposium participant Joe Duff, Michael Stolee said that the usual way of dealing with this issue has been ruled illegal in the California case - i.e., the definition of a school as desegregated if it is within 15 percent of the racial proportions of the district as a whole. Yet, while the State Supreme Court says that planners shouldn't use numbers, it is impossible to really desegregate without numbers. The use of "a community's perception of a school as segregated" is too hard to measure.

After desegregation, how is integration to be achieved? What really are "Currently Integrated Schools", a category of schools defined as not needing desegregation by the School Board's plan? In fact, according to some expert witnesses, many of these are schools in the process of becoming segregated. Studies of so-called integrated schools are needed.

Another issue raised by Stolee concerns the documentation of strategies that can help educators to stress positive aspects of different cultures. Can we merge cultures without submerging them? What does this really mean? He asked anthropologists to address this issue.

School desegregation is viewed differently by different people. For some, it is a right, for others a moral issue, and for others it is a way to improve education for minority students. What is its purpose and how do different groups in our society perceive this purpose? What have been the effects on our society as a whole? Why is there a gap between what school systems say and what they do? Why are coercive efforts needed? These questions could be explored by anthropologists .

With regard to the panelists' frustrations due to their experience with CACSI and the fact that the Board turned down their plan, Stolee recounted similar experiences that took place in two other cities. "In all three communities," he said, "citizens worked hard, and in all three the Board turned down their plan." What can be the impact of citizen groups? Can desegregation advocates capitalize on the fact that these groups usually do propose to do more than the Boards accept?"

CONCLUSION

The many participants in this symposium addressed the issues of school desegregation in Los Angeles from diverse points of view which reflected their ethnicity - the experiences they have had as Asians, blacks, Hispanics, Jews, and "other whites". They also saw realities from their perspective as lawyers, court witnesses, community activists, school administrators, minority scholars and desegregation planners; different concerns and questions were raised because they had to consider desegregation both from their own perspective and from that of the constituents they represented and the people they interacted with in the process of change. A lawyer found himself struggling with the "fit" between social realities of community perceptions about predominantly minority schools and a court that accepted the definition of a desegregated school as 70 percent black or combined minority and 30 percent "other white". An Hispanic parent and community leader refused to accept the judge's idea that the court could decide who was an "acculturated" Hispanic and who was not. An Asian made a plea for recognition of cultural differences - he was not "semi-white". An administrator asked for help in understanding the stresses of implementing desegregation when the board and society was becoming more and more conservative. Another administrator asked that the impact of teacher attitudes be understood and changed if possible. A black parent and media specialist wanted a study of the impact of media coverage on community attitudes and behavior toward desegregation. Participants who had worked for years and years with community groups and with CACSI expressed their frustrations at being part of a democratic process that proved to be irrelevant when the time came for final decisions to be made.

To all of these participants, desegregation was a complex social phenomena. It was not just about test scores. Desegregation was about the perceptions of people - how they saw themselves fitting into the social structure of society and how they saw others perceiving them. It was about the difficulty of change that takes so long - as policies on housing increase segregation, as new immigration adds to the cultural and linguistic diversity of the community, as children continue to be educated in racially isolated schools, and communities are surrounded by invisible walls of isolation from one another. To understand desegregation involves understanding the complexity of our cities and our organizations. A broad research approach is needed, and input from anthropology would be relevant.

Some researchers on the panel stressed the contributions ehtnographers could make by bringing to awareness inter-group behaviors and attitudes that shape dav-to-day interactions in desegregated schools. Others stressed the need to look at communities in a systematic way and discover how the history between groups and current political and economic relationships affect desegregation implementation. The attitudes and values of teachers and parents should also be explored. Participants saw the multi-faceted nature of desegregation planning and implementation and suggested multi-faceted approaches to studying it.

As we moved into the 1970's and tried to plan and implement desegregation in complex and large cities in the North and the West, researchers began to recognize that weakly designed and rapidly undertaken studies that focussed narrowly on immediate achievement scores were not going to be sufficient. Conceptualization of desegregation processes was lacking and the data did not "fit" the phenomena. It was not a single intervention that could be examined from a single point of view. As Elizabeth Cohen has stated, a need to rethink what we are studying is related to how we go about studying it.

> In a deep intellectual sense, social-scientists do not know what they are talking about when they speak of the desegregation situation. Desegregation does not represent a single phenomenon to be understood and manipulated with a single explanatory theory and a series of studies.[49]

While Cohen's work has lead to an exploration of status differences between black and white students in classrooms and schools, other researchers have stressed the need to look at status differences in the broader society. Havinghurst and Levine see the problems of school change in the context of socially stratified societies. In their view, schooling is such an important institution for the maintenance of privilege for the dominant group that there is a deep resistance to coordinated planning to change the social mobility relationships between groups.

> The effects of stratification and segregation in metropolitan society and its schools are such that education has become a primary mechanism for the accumulation of privileges which some social groups can pass on to their children and an institution which is unable to respond very well to the hope of less privileged groups that schooling will provide their children with anything resembling a truly equal chance in life.[50]

After reviewing most of the studies carried out after desegregation has taken place, St. John has suggested that anthropologists be tapped as desegregation researchers. She feels that the existing research has been too narrow and that we know little about what really goes on in classrooms. A shift in emphasis is needed from cognitive outcomes to social processes and perceptions. We need to understand leadership, human sensitivity and the cultural factors involved in conflict and change. The complexity of school climate factors and neighborhood environments needs to be understood. In addition to looking at outcomes, we need to pay attention to the attitudes and behaviors of staff.[51]

The National Institute of Education has recognized the need to broaden the research agenda related to desegregation. In a paper written in 1976 entitled "School Desegregation in the 1970's: Problems and Prospects," (NIE paper written by Harold Hodgkinson, then director of NIE, and Ray Rist, educational anthropologist and then Head of the Desegregation Studies Staff of the Educational Equity Group, July 23, 1976), NIE stated that desegregation was a dynamic as opposed to static phenomena; it didn't just take place at a point in time and then end. The time frame for understanding desegregation needs to be broadened as well as the goals for research. The classroom, the school, the court and the community all need to be studied. The type of research which was to be encouraged was undergoing change.

> The research activities being supported by the Staff can be characterized as emphasizing the analysis of social processes as opposed to quantifiable outcomes. Thus, the Staff supports no massive studies such as those undertaken by Coleman and his colleagues a decade ago. Likewise there is a de-emphasis of large scale collection of data on a variety of outcome measures, such as achievement scores, attendance patterns, post high school aspirations and the like. Much work in this area is already going

> on... Finally, the de-emphasis of outcome measures suggests that the Staff has sought to avoid allocating resources towards the resolution of academic debates that do not appear particularly relevant to the issues faced by parents, teachers, principals, school boards, and the children themselves as they strive to create viable integrated settings.[52]

Many of the questions raised by the NIE staff paper which set forth new directions in desegregation research were raised by the participants of this Los Angeles symposium, reinforcing the fact that they are indeed important to the actors whose lives are most affected by desegregation planning and implementation. For example, NIE asked that studies be longitudinal in perspective, that they look at teacher expectations, and community-school relationships, and that they consider the concurrent movements towards integration and bilingual education.

This NIE position paper was followed by the funding of six ethnographic studies in different school settings for a period of two and a half years. Dorothy Clement, who was symposium participant and a researcher of one of these studies, showed how the dynamics of social relationships lead to little real understanding of the perspectives of different groups within desegregated settings due to the inability of staff to deal explicitly with differences in knowledge, attitudes, and relationships. Parent advocates participating in the symposium found her presentation to be relevant; her work brought to the level of awareness many things they had seen going on in desegregated schools. They expressed their interest and concern about the social realities these settings created for their children.

Minority researchers listened to the multiple perspectives presented on Day I of the symposium and responded by highlighting historical realities, issues of identity, and the need to examine values and attitudes as well as social stratification within communities. Symposium participants reinforced the need to consider the multi-ethnic nature of our cities.

In the last few years, NIE has continued to refine and expand the framework needed for a study of desegregation. Recent conferences and position papers have urged studies to explore new approaches. In a recent paper, Gary Orfield,[53] one of the expert witnesses in the Los Angeles case, stressed the need to focus studies on the problems of linguistic and culturally different groups, especially Hispanics. He suggested not only looking at achievement, but also at language learning and use, perceptions that blacks, Hispanics and whites have of each other, and priorities that Hispanic parents have for their children's education. Problems of demographic changes in big cities, and especially of the growth and spread of ghettos and barrios need to be examined, according to Orfield. Also, we need to know the realities of predominantly minority school districts.

The relationships between our two largest minority groups, blacks and Hispanics, are just now being discussed, yet these two groups are presently the majority in some districts and soon to be the majority of students in other large cities. The black and Hispanic participants in this symposium were known to one another, for they had participated in meetings of CACSI and had shared the frustrations of dealing with a resistant school board. However, they listened to each other during these two days in a new way, perhaps hearing some new perceptions about what it means to be a minority in America. Generally, blacks know little about bilingual education and why Hispanic parents want it, and Hispanics know little about the long, painful history of desegregation litigation and why blacks get so angry when they perceive others wanting to get special considerations in the desegregation process.

A recent article in Black Enterprise was entitled, "Blacks and Hispanics: Coalition or Confrontation?". It raised the need for a greater understanding between these two groups. According to the article,

> If blacks are apprehensive about this sudden surge of interest in Hispanics, it is partly because they are aware that their own struggle for liberation is not ended...For many blacks, the question is simple: Will Hispanics become an obstacle to black progress or does their emergence mean a new ally in the increasingly complex struggle for a share of the American dream, for a share of the economic pie?[54]

With regard to desegregation, the answer is not clear. When Hispanics are asked to be part of the planning process for desegregation, they contribute as allies. Like Ruby Aguilar, symposium participant, they show that they can work effectively together with blacks towards school change. But, if they feel that bilingual education will be destroyed in the process, they do what they can to protect these programs. Having few resources and little political power, they may use strategies that would limit the extensiveness of desegregation in a city, making blacks mistrust their motivation and support. Both groups are just learning about the diversity of opinions and values that exists within them. Further dialogues, like those made possible by this symposium, are needed.

The most recent grant program proposed by NIE continues to reinforce the perspective of the Los Angeles symposium; namely, that desegregation is a social phenomenon and needs to be studied from various perspectives. Researchers are urged to continue to study classrooms and schools in terms of staff attitudes, school climate, and teacher expectations. Administrative leadership is another area of concern, both at the central office and building principal levels. NIE, like Al Moore in this symposium, gives recognition to the inter-relationships between housing policies and segregation. Just as Ruby Aguilar, Lynn Pineda and Marvin Tom asked our symposium audience to recognize the multiracial, multilingual nature of our cities, NIE asks researchers to submit proposals to address these issues. The implementation of bilingual education programs within a desegregation context also needs attention. Finally, NIE proposes that a symposium be organized, (such as the one that took place in Los Angeles), where different perspectives on desegregation could be shared so that the goals and processes of desegregation can be better understood.

> Such work could draw upon analysis of legal principles; the different concerns of racial, national origin, practioner, and vested interest groups; and the findings from various disciplines.[55]

This symposium report is an effort to provide feedback to the research enterprise from just such a carefully organized symposium. The authors hope that other such symposia will indeed be organized, for many questions remain about the nature of desegregation. As we move to a more conservative national climate, it is essential that the dialogue about inequality in our schools and in our society continue, and that researchers from various disciplines, including anthropology, take part.

Finally, a word about Margaret Mead seems appropriate. The Anthropology Association meetings in Los Angeles opened on November 15, 1978, the day of her death. Anthropologists involved in the symposium shared stories about her abilities, her concerns, and her humanity. Almost every speaker on Saturday took a few minutes to pay tribute to her. In many ways, her life as an activist scholar had inspired those in the symposium and in the audience. Her legacy to social science, according to the New York Times article on November 16, 1978, exemplified the idea of an interdisciplinary approach to understanding and solving social problems:

> (she) must be regarded as a pioneer whose innovations in research method have helped social anthropology to come of age as a science. For example, she played a major role in broadening the base of information upon which anthroplogists draw their conclusions. At one time, this base was confined to detailed observations of behavior that could be statistically analyzed. Dr. Mead, with her wide-ranging mind, drew upon the findings of other scientific disciplines as well...This broad-based approach is typical of the best anthropological work today...Dr. Mead...remained one of anthropology's leading experts on the ways in which people cope with change, both as maturing individuals and as societies undergoing cultural upheaval.

Judith T. Guskin and Rae Alexander-Minter dedicate this report to her memory. We only hope that our efforts will enlighten some people about the complexity of one of the most controversial issues of our day, school desegregation.

FOOTNOTES

1. William Ellis, "Los Angeles: City in Search of Itself," National Geographic, 155 (1), January, 1979.

2. "Emic" refers to knowledge about a culture from the perspective of its members.

3. California State Board of Education, Racial and Ethnic Distribution of Students and Staff in California Public Schools. (Sacramento: California State Board of Education, 1977)

4. Beatriz Arias, A Report to the Honorable Judge Paul Egly: The Desegregation Plan's Impact on Services to Limited and Non-English Speaking Students and Hispanic Students. (Presented to the court on 6 November, 1978.)

5. Bernard R. Gifford, Towards a Workable Remedy: Maximizing Integrated Educational Settings and Equalizing Resources Allocation Policies - RESOURCES The Los Angeles Unified School District. A Response to the Crawford Mandate. (Presented to the court on 6 November, 1978.)

6. California State Constitution, Article 1, S7 (a).

7. Crawford vs. Board of Education of The City of Los Angeles, 17 Cal. 3d 280.

8. Carlos Manuel Haro, Mexicano/Chicano Concerns and School Desegregation in Los Angeles. (Los Angeles: University of California, Chicano Studies Center, 1977), p. 18.

9. U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, A Generation Deprived: Los Angeles School Desegregation. (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, May, 1977), pp. 13 - 14 and pp. 214 - 216.

10. Ibid., pp. 213 - 218

11. Text of Judge Egly's Opinion as reported in The Los Angeles Times, 10 July, 1977.

12. National Institute of Education, A Citizen's Guide to School Desegregation Law. (Washington, D.C.: National Institute of Education, 1978.)

13. Minute Order C822 854, 22 February, 1978.

14. Los Angeles Times, 8 September, 1978.

15. Ibid.

16. "Tension Shows at Meeting of 30 Teachers at Midsite," Los Angeles Times, 6 September, 1978.

17. "School Busing Seesaw - Parents Angry, Confused," Los Angeles Times, 8 September, 1978.

18. "Seeks Role as Peacemaker - Bradley Taking Heat for Not Taking a Stand on Busing," Los Angeles Times, 8 September, 1978.

19. "Rehnquist Won't Halt Busing," Los Angeles Times, 9 September, 1978.

20. "School Bus Routes," Los Angeles Times, 6 September, 1978.

21. "Areawide Integration Urged," Los Angeles Times, 14 November, 1978.

22. "Metropolitan Integration Plan Survives Ruling," Los Angeles Times, 7 November, 1978.

23. Milliken vs. Bradley, 418 U.S. 717, 1974.

24. For a review of metropolitan desegregation issues, see U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, Metropolitan Desegregation. (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, February, 1977.)

25. Los Angeles Times, 14 November, 1978.

26. "Areawide Integration Urged," Los Angeles Times, 14 November, 1978.

27. "Districts Around L.A. React with Alarm to Metropolitan School Integration Plan," Los Angeles Times, 15 November, 1978.

28. Los Angeles Times, 14 November, 1978.

29. Robert Crain, A Report to Judge Egly, Superior Court of the State of California. (Presented to the Court, 6 November, 1978.) See Table 7.

30. Ross vs. Houston Independent School District.

31. Crain, op. cit., p. 32

32. Arias, op. cit.

33. Hispanic Urban Center, Acculturated Hispanics, An unpublished position paper, May 1977.

34. Haro as quoted by Gary Orfield, Desegregation Principles for Los Angeles, A Report to the Superior Court of the State of California for the County of L.A. (Presented to the court 1 November, 1978.)

35. In the Boston case, orientals were considered to be "whites".

36. Orfield, op. cit.

37. U.S.Commission on Civil Rights, A Generation Deprived: Los Angeles School Desegregation, op. cit., p. 134.

38. The article St. Clair Drake referred to is found in Higgins, Kilson, and Fox (editors) Key Issues in the Afro-American Experiences. (New York: Harcourt Brace, Inc., 1971.)

39. Edmund W. Gordon, "Toward an Understanding of Educational Equity," Equal Opportunity Review (New York: Teachers College, Columbia University, August, 1976), p. 3.

40. John Ogbu, Minority Education and Caste: The American System in Cross-Cultural Perspective. (New York: Academic Press, 1978) and John Ogbu, The Next Generation (New York: Academic Press, 1974)

41. "Blacks Lag Blamed on Futility", Milwaukee Journal, 5 March, 1978.

42. Eleanor B. Leacock, Teaching and Learning in City Schools: A Comparative Study. (New York: Basic Books, 1969) as discussed by Ogbu in "Social Stratification and the Socialization of Competence". Anthropology and Education Quarterly, Vol. X (1), 1979, pp. 3 - 20.

43. John Ogbu, "Racial Stratification and Education, The Case of Stockton California," IRCD Bulletin. (New York: Teachers College, Columbia University, Vol, XII (3), 1977)

44. Henry T. Trueba, Grace Pung Guthrie, and Kathryn Hu-Pei Av, (editors), Culture and the Bilingual Classroom: Studies in Classroom Ethnography. (Rowley, Mass.: Newbury House - to be published in 1981)

45. Willis D. Hawley, John McConahay, Christine Russell, Dennis Encarnation, and William Trent, Increasing the Effectiveness of Desegregated Schools: Lessons From the Research. An unpublished manuscript based on papers by members of the National Review Panel on School Desegregation. (Durham, N.C.: Duke University, April 1980.)

46. Robert E. Slavin, MultiRacial Student Team Instructional Programs and Race Relations in Desegregated Schools. A paper presented at the American Educational Research Association meeting, 1978, and Elizabeth Cohen, "The Effects of Desegregation on Race Relations," Law and Contemporary Problems, Vol. 39 (2), 1975, pp. 271 - 300.

47. Dorothy Clement, Teacher Socializatiuon of Black/White Relations In a Southern Desegregated School: Pressure and Adaptations. A paper presented at the American Educational Research Association Meetings, 1978, p. 13.

48. Solon T. Kimball and Charles Wagley, Race and Culture in School and Community, Final Report included in ERIC: ED091489, 1974.

49. Elizabeth Cohen, Design and Redesign of the Desegregated School: Problems of Status, Power and Conflict. An unpublished manuscript. (Palo Alto, California: Stanford University, 1978.)

50. Daniel Levine and Robert J. Havinghurst, The Future of Big-City Schools: Desegregation Policies and Magnet Alternatives. (Berkeley, California: McCutchen Publishing Corp., 1977.)

51. Nancy St. John, School Desegregation Outcomes For Children (New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1975.)

52. Harold Hodgkinson and Ray Rist, School Desegregation in the 1970's: Problems and Prospects. (Washington, D.C.: National Institute of Education, 23 July, 1976, p. 18.)

53. Gary Orfield, Memorandum to Participants in the NIE Regional Meetings on Desegregation Research. (Washington, D.C.: National Institute of Education, 12 October, 1979.)

54. "Blacks and Hispanics: Coalition or Confrontation", Black Enterprise, July 1979.

55. National Institute of Education, Grants for Research on Desegregation. (Washington, D.C.: NIE Program on Educational Policy and Organization, Fiscal Year 1981.